

THE CLERGY REVIEW

Vol. XI.

No. 1

Chairman, Editorial Board: **HIS GRACE THE
ARCHBISHOP OF LIVERPOOL.**

Editor: **Rev. T. E. FLYNN, Ph.D., M.A.**

Assistant Editor: **The Very Rev. J. M. T.
BARTON, D.D., L.S.Scr.**

JAN.

1936

THE VICISSITUDES OF FREQUENT COMMUNION. By the Rev. J.
CARTMELL, D.D., Ph.D., M.A.

THE SCANDAL OF THE SAINTS. By the Rev. STEPHEN RIGBY.

COLLECTIVE SECURITY IN ST. AUGUSTINE. By the Rev. J. P.
WADSWORTH.

THE ESSENCE OF THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS. By the Rev. C.
LATTEY, S.J.

For other Features and Full Contents, see page iv.

THE UNIVERSE

184, Strand, London, W.C.2.

Monthly: £1 or 5 dollars per year post free.

BURNS OATES

PUBLISHERS TO THE HOLY SEE

PRAYER BOOKS — MISSALS GENERAL CATHOLIC LITERATURE

*Theology, Philosophy, Hagiology, Biography, Fiction,
and Belles Lettres*

THE PREMIER HOUSE FOR
**CHURCH FURNITURE
CARVED WOOD-WORK
BRASS & SILVER WARE
STATUES & PICTURES**

*DEVOTIONAL ARTICLES
OF EVERY DESCRIPTION*

Catalogues, post free, to any address

BURNS OATES & WASHBOURNE Ltd.

43-45 Newgate Street, E.C.1 & 129 Victoria Street, S.W.1

And at Manchester, Birmingham, Glasgow and Dublin.

THE CLERGY REVIEW

A MAGAZINE FOR THE CLERGY

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

Chairman of the Editorial Board :
HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP OF LIVERPOOL.

Editor :
THE REV. T. E. FLYNN, Ph.D., M.A.

Assistant Editor :
THE VERY REV. J. M. T. BARTON, D.D., L.S.Scr.

VOLUME XI, No. 1.

JANUARY, 1936.

Proprietors

"THE UNIVERSE,"
(Associated Catholic Newspapers, 1912, Ltd.)
184, Strand, London, W.C.2

BOOKS RECEIVED

- TRACTATUS CANONICO—MORALIS DE SACRAMENTIS, Vol. II, Part III, by Felix Cappello. (Marietti, 710 pp. Lire 27.)
- CIRCULUS PHILOSOPHICUS, Vol. II, Ontologia, by C. Carbone. (Marietti. 600 pp. Lire 18.)
- INSTITUTIONES IURIS CANONICI, Vol. IV, by Matthaeus a Coronata. (Marietti. 680 pp. Lire 30.)
- MODERN THOMISTIC PHILOSOPHY, Vol. II, by R. P. Phillips, D.D. (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. 400 pp. 9s.)
- THE LIFE AND WORKS OF ST. VINCENT DE PAUL, Vol. III, by Pierre Costs, C.M., translated by Joseph Leonard, C.M. (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. 563 pp. 21s.)
- QUEEN ELIZABETH AND THE ENGLISH CATHOLIC HISTORIANS, by Joseph Bernard Code. (Bureau du Recueil, Bibliotheque de L'Universite. 230 pp.)
- THE CHRISTIAN SOCIAL TRADITION, by Reginald Tribe. (Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. 293 pp. 5s.)
- THE MAGDALENE QUESTION, translated from the German of Dr. Peter Ketter by the Rev. Hugo C. Koehler, M.A. (G. E. J. Coldwell. 102 pp. 3s.)
- THE CATHOLIC FAITH IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS, by the Rev. F. G. Baring and the Rev. G. J. Ince. (Williams & Norgate, Ltd. 144 pp. 4s. 6d.)
- BARCHESTER PILGRIMAGE, by Ronald A. Knox. (Sheed & Ward. 278 pp. 7s. 6d.)
- SAINT THOMAS MORE, by the Rev. Sir John R. O'Connell. (Gerald Duckworth & Co., Ltd. 208 pp. 6s.)
- ROMAN MISSAL, New Edition. Cloth, 6s. (Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd.)
- A CLOISTERED COMPANY, by Henry Chester Mann. (Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. 196 pp. 6s.)
- THE FIRE OF LOVE, by G. C. Heseltine. (Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. 198 pp. 7s. 6d.)
- THE LIFE THAT IS LIGHT, Three vols., by Archbishop Goodier, S.J. (Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. 5s. each vol.)
- LE PERE WILLIAM DOYLE, S.J., by Alfred O'Rahilly. (P. Lethielleux. 477 pp. 18 frs.)
- JESUS DE NAZARETH, by Th. Salvagniac. (P. Lethielleux. 532 pp. 30 frs.)
- LE MYSTERE DES JUIFS ET DES GENTILS DANS L'EGLISE, by Erik Peterson. (Desclee de Brouwer. 102 pp. 10 frs.)
- THE COMING CIVILIZATION, by Kenneth Ingram. (George Allen & Unwin, Ltd. 208 pp. 6s.)
- SIR SAMUEL ROMILLY, 1757-1818, by C. G. Oakes. (George Allen & Unwin, Ltd. 440 pp. 18s.)
- THE PASSION AND MARTYRDOM OF THE HOLY ENGLISH CARTHUSIAN FATHERS, by Dom Maurice Chauncy, Edited by the Rev. G. W. S. Curtis. (The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. 165 pp. 8s. 6d.)
- LES EXERCICES SPIRITUELS, by the Rev. Fr. Albert Valensin, S.J. (Desclee de Brouwer. 192 pp. 10 frs.)
- HEALING: PAGAN AND CHRISTIAN, by George Gordon Dawson, M.A. (Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. 322 pp. 9s.)
- ARTHUR LEE, by Rev. Thomas P. Phelan, LL.D. (New York, P. J. Kennedy & Sons. 282 pp. \$2.00.)
- FEASTS OF OUR LADY, by the Rev. James F. McElhone, C.S.C. (Bruce Publishing, Milwaukee; G. E. J. Coldwell, London. 98 pp. 4s. 6d.)
- THE HEART OF THE KING, by Silvano Matulich, O.F.M. (Bruce Publishing, Milwaukee; G. E. J. Colwell, London. 133 pp. 5s. 6d.)
- A RETURN TO THE NOVITIATE, by Mgr. Alcine Gouraud. (New York, P. J. Kennedy & Sons. 289 pp. \$2.00.)
- THE CATHOLIC TRADITION OF THE LAW OF NATIONS, by John Eppstein. (Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. 525 pp. 15s.)

- THE CATHOLIC ALMANACK, 1936. (Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. 2d.)
- THE BOOK OF THE SACRED HEART OF JESUS, by a Priest. (Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. 265 pp. 3s. 6d.)
- BLESSED GEMMA GALGANI (1878-1903), by Fr. Amedeo, C.P. Translated from the Italian by Fr. Osmund Thorpe, C.P. (Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. 365 pp. 12s. 6d.)
- A MANUAL OF CATHOLIC ACTION, by Mgr. Luigi Civardi. Translated by C. C. Martindale, S.J. (Sheed & Ward. 247 pp. 6s.)
- VALUES AND REALITY, by Leo Ward, C.S.G. (Sheed & Ward. 331 pp. 7s. 6d.)
- WM. MCGARVEY AND THE OPEN PULPIT, by Edward Hawks. (The Dolphin Press. 258 pp. \$2.00.)
- CATHOLIC LITURGICS. Translated and adapted from the German of Richard Stapper, S.T.D., by David Baier, O.F.M., S.T.D. (St. Anthony Guild Press, New Jersey. London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. 369 pp. \$3.00.)
- A DISCIPLE OF DOM MARMION, by Dom Pius de Hemptinne. Translated by the Benedictines of Teignmouth. (Sands & Co. 277 pp. 6s.)
- DIVINE COMMUNICATIONS. Translated from the French of the Abbe Auguste Saudreau, O.P. (Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. 2 Vols. 10s. the set.)
- FROM BYE-WAYS AND HEDGES, by C. C. Martindale, S.J. (Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. 128 pp. 2s. 6d.)
- RED GAOLS, A Woman's experiences in Russian Prisons. Translated from the French by O. B. (Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. 67 pp. 2s. 6d.)
- JESUIT SPIRITUALITY, by Rev. H. V. Gill, S.J. (Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd. 134 pp. 3s. 6d.)
- TRAITE SUR LA PRESENCE DE DIEU, by P. Louis de Gonzague. (Italy: Casa Editrice, Collegio S. Lorenzo Da Brindisi, Assisi. 106 pp. 7 lire.)
- THIS WAY TO HEAVEN, by Very Rev. James McGlinchey, P.P., V.F. (Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd. 160 pp. 2s. 6d.)
- SCHOOLS OF KILDARE AND LEIGHLIN, A.D. 1775-1835, by Rev. Martin Brennan, M.A., B.D., Ph.D. (Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd. 616 pp. 10s.)

THE UNIVERSE

THE MOST WIDELY-READ
CATHOLIC PAPER

TWOPENCE WEEKLY.

By Post, 12s. 6d. per year.

184, STRAND, LONDON, W.C.2

CONTENTS

JANUARY, 1936

ARTICLES :—

1. The Vicissitudes of Frequent Communion, By the Rev. J. CARTMELL, D.D., Ph.D., M.A.	1
2. The Scandal of the Saints, By the Rev. STEPHEN RIGBY	16
3. Collective Security in St. Augustine, By the Rev. J. P. WADSWORTH	22
4. The Essence of the Sacrifice of the Mass, By the Rev. C. LATTEY, S.J.	31

HOMILETICS :—

By the Rev. C. C. MARTINDALE, S.J.	35
--	----

NOTES ON RECENT WORK :—

I. Dogmatic Theology, By the Very Rev. CANON G. D. SMITH, D.D., Ph.D.	46
II. Philosophy, By the Rev. T. E. FLYNN, Ph.D., M.A.	50
III. Economics and Sociology, By the Rev. LEWIS WATT, S.J., B.Sc.(Econ.)	54

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS :—

(1) Liturgica	61
(2) Reserved Censure	62
(3) Blessings	63
(4) Episcopal Throne	64
(5) Vespers during Exposition	64
By the Very Rev. CANON E. J. MAHONEY, D.D.	

BOOK REVIEWS	66
------------------------	----

REVIEWS FROM ABROAD	72
-------------------------------	----

THE CHURCH AT HOME AND ABROAD :—

I. France, By DENIS GWYNN, D.Litt.	75
II. Central Europe, By C. F. MELVILLE	78

CORRESPONDENCE	82
--------------------------	----

THE CLERGY REVIEW

THE VICISSITUDES OF FREQUENT COMMUNION

(First Article)

BY THE REV. J. CARTMELL, D.D., Ph.D., M.A.

“AND they persevered in the teaching of the apostles, and the fellowship, the breaking of the bread and the prayers.” “Day by day they persevered with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread at home, they took food with joyful simplicity of heart, praising God and in favour with the whole people.”¹

In this section of the Acts of the Apostles we have a succinct, but beautiful description of the life of the early Christians. They still frequented the temple, but they were already beginning to honour the first day of the week, along with the Sabbath, mainly in honour of the Resurrection, but also because God made light in the darkness and order in the chaos of His creation on the first day. On the Lord's day, as it was already called, in the evening, they had a special celebration of the Eucharist, with a sermon, prayers and psalms. On every other evening they broke bread from house to house. This daily bread-breaking was the reception of Communion. Such is, it seems, the only reasonable interpretation of the above two texts, taken together; *fractio panis* was already a consecrated phrase for the Eucharist; and traditional interpretation has so under-

¹ Acts ii., 42, 46. Westminster version.

stood them.² The Mass could hardly be celebrated each evening in every place of assembly. It was celebrated at least on the Sunday, and the Christians carried away with them the sacred species to be received in their home assemblies each evening after the evening meal, as Our Lord had given Himself after His last evening meal.

By the end of the first century the Sunday celebrations of Mass was the normal rule. Thus the Didache says: "Coming together on the Lord's day, break bread and give thanks, after you have confessed your sins, that your sacrifice may be clean."³ And St. Justin Martyr (c. A.D. 150), in his beautiful description of the primitive Roman Mass, written for the benefit of the Emperor, tells us that the gathering of all town and country Christian folk takes place on what is called the day of the sun. It is to such an assembly that Pliny the Younger is referring in his letter to Trajan, when he says that before sunrise on a fixed day the Christians were accustomed to assemble and sing a hymn to Christ as to God. The practice of these Christians, so near the apostolic time, seems to prove that the apostles themselves had the rule of celebrating once a week, on Sunday. The Mass was now a morning celebration. The Christians were entirely severed from the Jews, and had fused, so to say, the Sabbath observance with their own, so that they met in the night of Saturday to Sunday for a kind of Vigil office, whence developed our Matins, and in the early morning offered Mass.

At this Sunday Mass all present went to communion. St. Justin writes: "But after he who presides has completed the thanksgiving (i.e., the consecration) and all the people have assented, those who with us are called deacons distribute the bread, wine and water over which thanks have been offered to *each* of those

² Some Catholic writers, v.g., P. Dublanchy in *Dict. de Théol. Cath.*, III, col. 516, do not admit that the frequency of Communion is clear from these texts. But the likeness between v. 42 and the first part of v. 46 hardly justifies a different sense of "breaking bread" in the two cases. For the interpretation cf. Fr. Lattey's careful note in the Westminster Version.

³ XIV, 1. Funk: *Patres Apost.*, ed. 2: I, 32.

present to be partaken of, and they carry to those who are absent."⁴ It was; then, the principle in the early Church that all who attended Mass should communicate, unless they were debarred by heinous sin. In this way the Church emphasized the unity of the faithful in the Body of Christ: "one bread, one body, all who partake of one bread."⁵ The Blessed Sacrament was to them symbol and instrument of their unity.

It seems lawful to assume that the faithful communicated much more frequently than at the weekly Mass. In condemning mixed marriages Tertullian makes a point of the difficulty a Christian wife experiences when she wishes to communicate before taking food.⁶ St. Basil informs us that during the persecutions Christians were allowed to communicate themselves; that the solitaries kept the Eucharist in their cells and gave it to themselves; and that at Alexandria and in Egypt the people had the communion at home and received it when they wished.⁷ The Roman Church in the fourth century had a tradition of daily communion, going back, it was claimed, to SS. Peter and Paul;⁸ but, as we shall see, it had no such tradition of daily Mass. All this evidence points to the conclusion that home-communion was customary from the earliest times. It was taken, it would seem, at the discretion of the recipient, daily even, if such was the practice of the local community.

The daily celebration of Mass was introduced gradually into the Church. Quite early the African Church had two celebrations a week in addition to the Sunday Mass. These were on the station or fast days, Wednesday and Friday, which commemorated Our Lord's betrayal by Judas and His Passion. Tertullian upbraids certain rigorists who refused to attend the liturgy on those days, for fear of breaking their fast by receiving the Eucharist.⁹ Rome, however, and Alexandria did not have Mass on

⁴ *Apologia*, I, c. 65, *P.G.*, VI, 428.

⁵ I Cor. x., 17.

⁶ *Ad Uxorem*, II, 5, *P.L.*, I, 1296. From this text it is clear that fasting communion was already in vogue.

⁷ *Epistolae*, 93, *P.G.*, XXXII, 484.

⁸ *Vita S. Melaniae*, c. 32, in *Analect. Bolland.*, 8, p. 57.

⁹ *de Oratione*, c. 19, *P.L.*, I, 1181.

the two fast days; nor did Jerusalem until the fourth century. They merely had assemblies of the faithful for the reading of the Scriptures, a homily and prayers.¹⁰ The anniversaries of martyrs began to be celebrated as feast days with Mass from the second century. Thus the Church of Smyrna kept St. Polycarp's feast from the time of his martyrdom (A.D. 155). But it was not until the third century that the practice became universal: Rome was among the last to adopt it.¹¹ Once the idea of keeping feasts had taken root, it was extended from the martyrs to the mysteries of Our Lord's life, to Our Lady and the Apostles; so that by the fourth century what may be called the skeleton of our ecclesiastical year was already in existence.

Africa seems to have had actual daily celebration by the middle of the third century. "It is a great honour and glory of our episcopate," writes St. Cyprian,¹² "to have given peace to the martyrs, that we priests who daily celebrate the Divine sacrifices should prepare offerings and victims for God." With daily Mass there was naturally daily communion for the people. St. Cyprian again says: "Give us this day our daily bread. . . . For Christ is the bread of life, and this is not the bread of all, but it is ours. . . . This Bread we ask to be given to us daily, lest we who are in Christ and daily receive His Eucharist for the food of salvation . . . should be separated from the Body of Christ through the intervention of some grave sin."¹³ By daily drinking of the Blood of Christ, he says elsewhere, will the soldiers of Christ gain strength to shed their blood for Christ.¹⁴ Africa was still retaining the practice a century and a half later, even though many other Churches, especially in the East, had not adopted

¹⁰ Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, ch. VIII, 1.

¹¹ Duchesne, *op. cit.*, ch. VIII, 5. The Sunday feasts of Easter and Pentecost date from the earliest times.

¹² Ep. 57, n. 3, *P.L.*, III, 857. The phrase "to have given peace to the martyrs" means "to have given reconciliation to the lapsed on the outbreak of persecution, even before penance was completed, that they might become martyrs." Not all parts of the Church had this generous practice by this time.

¹³ *De Dominica Oratione*, c. 18, *P.L.*, IV, 531.

¹⁴ Ep. 58, n. 1, *P.L.*, IV, 350 (ep. 56).

it. "I had promised you," says St. Augustine to the neophytes, "you who are now baptized, a sermon in which I should explain the Sacrament of the Lord's table, which now you see and of which last night you were made partakers. You ought to know what you have received, what you will receive, what you ought to receive daily. The bread which you see on the altar, sanctified by the word of God, is the Body of Christ. The chalice, or rather that which the chalice contains, sanctified by the word of God, is the Blood of Christ."¹⁵ Like St. Cyprian, St. Augustine also interprets the daily bread of the Our Father as referring to the Holy Eucharist. "This petition for daily bread is to be understood in two ways, both to meet the necessity of material sustenance and also to satisfy the need of spiritual nourishment. There is the need of material food for our daily support; without it we cannot live. Both food and covering is meant, but the whole is understood from the part. When we ask for bread, we receive everything. The faithful also know a spiritual nourishment, which you too will know, when you receive it from the altar of God. It too will be a daily bread, necessary for this life."¹⁶

But St. Augustine was not prepared to insist that other parts of the Church should have the same practice as Africa. Difference of opinion must be tolerated; all must follow their own conscience and preserve the charity of Christ towards those who differed. "There are different practices," he says, "in different places and regions. Some fast on Saturdays, others do not;¹⁷ some daily communicate in the Body and Blood of the Lord, others receive on certain days; in some places no day goes by without Mass being offered, in other places it is offered on Saturday and Sunday only, in others only on Sunday. . . . Things of this kind have no fixed observance; nor is there any better rule for the serious

¹⁵ Sermo 227 in die Paschae, *P.L.*, XXXVIII, 1099.

¹⁶ Sermo 57, n. 7. To the Catechumens, *P.L.*, XXXVIII, 389.

¹⁷ The Saturday fast seems to have originated as a prolongation of the Friday fast. It existed locally in Tertullian's day and was common in the third century. The Christians celebrated it in the same way and with the same variations as the other fast days.

and prudent Christian than that he should act as he sees the Church acting, to which he belongs. . . . Some one will say that you must not receive the Eucharist daily. If you ask the reason, he replies that those days are to be chosen on which a man lives more purely and more continently, in order that he may worthily approach so great a sacrament; for he that eateth unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself. Another on the contrary will say that if one is affected with such a wound of sin and attack of disease that these medicines are to be deferred, one should be precluded from the altar for the doing of penance by the authority of the bishop and be reconciled by the same authority. For that is an unworthy reception, if a man receives when he should be doing penance, but not if at his own will and choice he refrains or goes. But if a man's sins are not so great that he is judged worthy of excommunication, then he ought not to deprive himself of the daily medicine of the Lord's Body. Perhaps one would correctly settle this dispute by advising both parties to abide above all things in the peace of Christ. Let each do what he piously believes, according to his faith, ought to be done. For neither of them dishonours the Body and Blood of the Lord, but both are zealous to honour the health-giving Sacrament. Zachæus and the centurion did not contend with one another, nor did either of them prefer himself to the other, when the one received the Lord into his house with joy and the other said, Lord, I am not worthy that Thou shouldst enter under my roof. Both were honouring the Saviour in a different and almost opposite manner. Both were wretched with sins; both had obtained mercy. To honour the Sacrament, one Christian dare not receive it daily, and the other dare not omit it for one day."¹⁸

It is clear from this passage that not only did various churches differ in their practice of frequent communion, but also Christians of the one locality differed among themselves. Some stressed the dispositions required for a worthy reception; others our need of the divine Food to keep us worthy. St. Augustine says in effect that both are right, but let each follow his conscience. So while he

¹⁸ Ep. 54, ad inquisitiones Januarii, 2, 3, *P.L.*, XXXIII, 200, 201.

stressed for his Africans the spiritual meaning of the fourth petition of the Lord's prayer, he was not prepared to insist on it to the condemnation of those who did not have daily communion. The petition means, he says, either the things that sustain the body, or the sacrament of the Body of Christ which we daily receive, or spiritual food of the divine precepts which daily we must meditate and fulfil. He accepts the first and the third sense, because the Easterns, with full ecclesiastical approval, do not communicate daily and would resist the Eucharistic interpretation of Our Lord's formula, and because one may say the Lord's prayer many times a day even after the one reception of communion.¹⁹

St. Basil and St. John Chrysostom confirm St. Augustine's statement that the Holy Eucharist was not received daily in the greater part of the East. Custom differed considerably in the various churches. St. Basil says: "We (in Asia Minor) communicate four times each week, on the Lord's day, the fourth day, the Parasceve, and the Sabbath, and on the other days if there is the commemoration of a saint." But he recognizes the value and utility of daily communion, and is prepared to allow reception at home on days when there is no public celebration, justifying himself by the traditional practice of such communion in the days of persecution and among the solitaries and with the people of Alexandria and Egypt generally.²⁰ St. John Chrysostom complains that although Mass is said daily at Constantinople, yet the laity do not come to communion. Some receive only once a year, others twice, on the Epiphany, during Lent or at Easter; others frequently. But even some of those who go often, appear to go through routine, and not from true devotion. He praises and encourages daily communion. But he insists on the presence of the right dispositions: a blameless life, full of good works, purity of soul and piety.²¹

Rome, like Africa, had daily communion. It was an

¹⁹ *De Sermone Domini in Monte*, II, c. 7, *P.L.*, XXXIV, 1280, 1281.

²⁰ Ep. 93, ad *Cæsariam patriciam*, *P.G.*, XXXII, 484.

²¹ In Ep. I ad Cor., hom. XXVIII, n. 1; In Ep. ad Eph., hom. III, n. 4; In Ep. ad Heb., hom. XVII, n. 4.

apostolic tradition there. The contemporary life of St. Melania Junior, who died in A.D. 439, says of her: "She never took bodily food until first she had received the communion of the Body of the Lord. She received this Body particularly for the protection of her soul, although it is the custom of the Romans to communicate every day. For from the first the apostles, B. Peter, who was the bishop, and B. Paul who ended his days there, established this tradition."²² St. Jerome states that Spain also had daily communion.

St. Jerome hesitated to approve of these general practices of daily communion; but he accepted the principle that each church should act in the matter as it thought fit. He writes, "I know that at Rome there is the custom that the faithful always receive the Body of Christ; I neither blame it nor approve it, for each abounds in his own sense." He had no difficulty in the case of the unmarried or monks; but with the married there was the difficulty which St. Paul expressed (I Cor. vii., 5) that marital relations hindered prayer. "Which is greater, to pray or to receive the Body of Christ? Surely to receive the Body of Christ. If the lesser is hindered, how much more the greater?" If after the use of marriage Christians do not dare to visit the tombs of the martyrs or go to church for communion, how dare they receive communion at home? Therefore they must in these circumstances abstain from communion for a day or two.²³ St. Jerome was here stating a widespread discipline of the Church. Though not universally adhered to in his day, it is universally affirmed in subsequent centuries. St. Cæsarius of Arles, leader of the Bishops of Gaul in the early sixth century, told his people that as often as they came to the church on any solemnity and wished to receive the sacraments of Christ, they should preserve chastity for several days, that they might be able to approach the altar with a safe conscience. But he allowed an exception if marriage was used merely for the procreation of children.²⁴ A

²² In *Analect. Bolland.* (8), p. 57.

²³ Ep. 48, ad Pammachium, c. 15, *P.L.*, XXII, 505. St. Augustine refers to this same opinion in the passage (Ep. 54) which I have quoted: "those days are to be chosen on which a man lives *more purely and more continently*."

²⁴ Sermo 292, n. 3, *P.L.*, XXXIX, 2298.

century later St. Gregory the Great wrote in exactly the same sense to St. Augustine of Canterbury. At the same time St. Isidore of Seville states the Spanish discipline: "Several days must be chosen during which a man lives continently before he can be worthy to approach so great a sacrament"²⁵ In the eighth century St. Nicholas the First, writing to the Bulgarians, at least implies the same teaching. St. Bede says that married people may communicate on Sundays and feast days provided they preserve the measure of continence. Penitentials and Councils also imposed continence before communion; thus, for instance, the so-called Penitential of St. Theodore of Canterbury, which says that the Greeks and Romans observed it for three days before receiving; the Irish Penitential of Cummean, which also assigns three days; the ninth century Council of Chalon, which cites the example of David when he took the loaves of proposition; the *Liber legum ecclesiasticarum*, an English compilation of the late tenth century. The same tradition was upheld to some extent in the Church till quite recent times. In A.D. 1587 the Sacred Congregation of the Council, replying to the Bishop of Brescia, who had asked for guidance on the question of daily communion, especially with reference to traders and the married, quoted the text of St. Paul (I Cor. vii., 5) and continued, "tanto magis ad sacratissimae Eucharistiae reverentiam continentiae vacandum, puriorique mente ad caelestium epularum communionem esse conveniendum." In A.D. 1679 the same Congregation in an instruction to the Bishops of Spain repeated that part of its previous decree in which this phrase occurs. It was an exhortation, not a positive law; and the Congregation in both cases was careful to affirm that the married (and traders) were not debarred by their state from daily communion, but the frequency with which they went must finally be determined by the judgment of the confessor. These decrees, are, of course, now obsolete. Leo XIII and Pius X emphasized that frequent and even daily communion was for all classes and conditions of men; and the famous decree of the Sacred Congregation of the Council of 1905, which finally determined the conditions of such communion, only

²⁵ De officiis ecclesiasticis, I, c. 18, P.L., LXXXIII, 756.

mentions the married to express surprise that they were ever as a class excluded by some theologians from frequenting the heavenly table.

But to return to the later patristic age. While the ecclesiastical authorities and the Fathers tended to put restrictions on married people, they did not therefore cease to encourage frequent and daily communion among the faithful. Monks everywhere were urged to receive daily. The famous monk, St. Nilus of Sinai, disciple of St. John Chrysostom, writes in his *Maxims*: "Every day be partaker of the mystical supper; for so our body begins to be the Body of Christ." His contemporary, the great Abbot Cassian of Marseilles, argues from the *Our Father*. "When He says 'daily,' He shows that on no day can we obtain spiritual life without Him; when He says 'to-day' He shows that He is to be taken daily and that yesterday's provision is not enough unless to-day also He is supplied to us"³⁶ This fourth petition of the *Our Father* was used by bishops and authorities generally to encourage daily communion among the people. St. Peter Chrysologus (5th cent.), the hymn-writer Venantius Fortunatus (6th cent.), St. Isidore of Seville and St. Ildephonsus of Toledo (7th cent.), and Alcuin (c. A.D. 800) are some of those in many parts of the West who used the petition in this way, and may therefore rightly be named as promoters of daily communion.

It is, however, very difficult to determine at any epoch after the spread of the Church throughout the Empire what proportion of the faithful were really frequent communicants, even in churches which were said to have the custom of daily communion. It seems to be true that after the persecutions were over, when fervour began to cool, many neglected the traditional rule that all who were present at Mass should receive communion. We have already met the laments of St. John Chrysostom over the remissness of his people. The tenth canon of the Canons of the Apostles (c. A.D. 400) decreed that all who entered the church and heard the Scriptures but did not remain in prayer nor receive holy communion should be excommunicated. In the West the general synod of the Visigothic kingdom held at Agde (in Languedoc)

³⁶ *Collationes*, IX, c. 21, P.L., XLIX, 795.

under the presidency of St. Cæsarius of Arles (A.D. 506) decided that layfolk who had not communicated at Christmas, Easter and Pentecost were not to be regarded as Catholics. A number of the faithful refrained out of piety, in order to prepare better for the Sacrament. St. Augustine in a passage I have already quoted brings forward their view without expressly condemning it. Cassian tells us that some monks in Egypt carried it to such excess as to receive only once a year. Authority strove to make Sunday communion, at least, a standard of observance. The Synod of Elvira in Spain (c. A.D. 300) resolved: "If anyone who is in the city does not come to church for three Sundays, let him be forbidden for a short time that he may be corrected." At Sardica half a century later Osius of Cordova effected the passing of the same decree, and it was adopted in the East, probably at some later date. Gennadius of Marseilles (c. A.D. 470) strongly urged Sunday communion; but like St. Jerome, he declined to praise or blame daily reception. But sentiment, in Gaul at any rate, had turned from frequent reception. Even on Sundays the people were leaving the Mass before the communion, and the final blessing had to be advanced to the Pater Noster that they might not go away unblessed; and decrees had to be passed to compel them to stay until this blessing. One of the canons of the general synod of Agde reads: "We decree by special order that on the Lord's day the entire Mass must be heard by the laity, so that the people must not presume to depart before the priest's blessing; if they do so, they must be publicly rebuked by the Bishop." Two other Gallic councils, held at Orleans in A.D. 511 and 538, issued a similar order.

Two centuries later St. Bede laments to St. Egbert of York the laxity of the people who received only at Christmas, the Epiphany and Easter. At the end of the eighth century a Bavarian synod at Ratisbon complains that the people passed the whole year without communicating, when they ought to be receiving weekly. But both St. Bede and the German synod contrast the conduct of their people with the practice of other parts of the church. "In the holy and apostolic Roman church," writes St. Bede, "very many innocent and chaste souls, boys and girls, young men and maidens, old men and women

receive on all Sundays and the feasts of the apostles and martyrs." He adds that daily communion is practised in Italy, Gaul, Africa, Greece and the whole East. The Bavarian synod says that the Romans, Franks and Greeks communicate every Sunday. But it is known that the Greeks at this time did not communicate weekly. It may be, however, that in some of the other places mentioned frequent communion was commoner than in England and South Germany; not, however, in Gaul and among the Franks, as we can gather from evidence right through the next century.

Thus the third council of Tours (A.D. 813), legislating for the Franks, re-affirmed the obligation of receiving three times a year at least. A council at Chalon-sur-Saône in the same year ordered reception once a year, on Holy Thursday, which some were neglecting. The second council of Aix-la-Chapelle (A.D. 836) laid down that communion should be received every Sunday and the modern custom of receiving rarely should be corrected. About the same time Bishop Jonas of Orleans was complaining that the majority only received on the three principal feasts, and that rather out of habit than devotion. Other bishops were content if they could get the people to the altar on the three feasts. Others again, v.g. Herard of Tours, and the Frankish *Paenitentiale Bigotianum I* tried to impose monthly communion.

In the tenth and eleventh centuries the situation was much the same. Some authorities were striving to obtain frequent communion by ordering that the faithful should receive on every Sunday of Lent, Holy Thursday, Good Friday, Holy Saturday and every day in Easter week; the fast and continence of Lent, to which all were bound, would be a fitting preparation. Others, v.g. the bishops of Vercellae and Verona among the Lombard peoples, insisted on reception three or four times a year, namely on the three great feasts and Holy Thursday.

In the twelfth century it was no different. The synod of Gran (A.D. 1124) commanded the laity to communicate at Christmas, Easter and Pentecost, after due preparation of penance, and clerics on all the greater feasts. St. Otto of Bamberg taught his Pomeranian converts the utility of frequent communion, but he insisted on reception only four times a year. The English Cardinal

Robert Pullen in his book of *Sentences* expressed the opinion that priests ought frequently to be strengthened by the Holy Eucharist but that the laity needed it at least three times a year. The Penitential of Milan ordered that the people should receive on Holy Thursday and at Easter, Pentecost and Christmas under penalty of a fast of twenty days on bread and water.²⁷

Such is the evidence for the practice of the faithful during the many centuries of the barbarian invasions and the civilizing of the new Germanic peoples. It is part of the general evil of the times, culminating in the disastrous tenth century. But authority never accepted this state of affairs as proper and desirable. Throughout, reforming bishops and synods were striving to check it by enforcing a minimum of observance, and to mend it by endeavouring to recall the better-disposed to the ancient ideal of frequent and daily communion. We have seen the details of the legislation. It remains to quote instances in which the ideal is set forth.

I have already mentioned the evidence previous to Alcuin (c. A.D. 800). In the ninth century Jonas of Orleans and Rabanus Maurus, Archbishop of Mainz, whose name is famous in Eucharistic theology, and other bishops adopted and published the teaching of St. Isidore of Seville that the Holy Eucharist is the daily Bread for which we pray in the Our Father and may be received daily by those in good dispositions; but they put the same restriction on the married as St. Isidore, except Rabanus, who is apparently silent on the matter. In the same century Walafrid Strabo, Abbot of Reichenau, poet and theologian, urged all to desire continually the Body and Blood of the Lord without which we cannot live; anyone could duly receive it, provided he was free from grave fault and had this constant keen desire along with humility. In the eleventh century St. Peter Damian advised daily communion to his nephew that he might live chastely in the world; and St. Gregory VII recommended frequent communion to "the faithful handmaid of St. Peter," Matilda, Countess of Tuscany. In the twelfth century St. Otto of Bamberg, as we have already seen, explained the value

²⁷ For fuller information on these historical details see the *Dict. de Théol. Cath.*, III, cols. 522-3.

of frequent communion to his Pomeranian neophytes; and Peter the Lombard, whose Sentences became the text-book of the Middle Ages, wrote: "This sacrament was instituted for two reasons: for the increase of charity, and as a medicine for daily infirmity." With regard to daily reception he quotes Augustine (really Gennadius), that he neither praises nor blames it; but he advises communion every Sunday.²⁸

As if to give point to their teaching and to compensate Our Lord for the coldness of the many, there were zealous bishops and priests during these sad centuries, who carried devotion to Holy Mass almost to excess. There was no law forbidding bination, and the practice grew up of celebrating twice and three times and even oftener in a day. Pope St. Leo III seems to hold the record. He celebrated seven and sometimes nine Masses a day. He was in marked contrast to his contemporary, St. Boniface, Apostle of Germany, who offered only once each day. Those who said several Masses argued that God's mercy was invoked every time the Passion of His Son was renewed; but mankind needs God's mercy always and cannot solicit it too insistently; therefore it was most fitting to renew the Passion as often as possible. But even this pious practice had its perverters. The avaricious adopted it to satisfy their dominant passion, and legislation had to intervene to stop or at least curtail it. The first law against it seems to have come from England, when St. Dunstan of Canterbury and St. Oswald of York commanded that no priest should say Mass more than three times a day at most. Further legislation in various countries limited the number to two. Finally, Alexander II decreed one Mass each day. "Christ suffered once," said the Pope, "and redeemed the whole world; it is no small thing to celebrate one Mass, and he is fortunate who celebrates one Mass worthily." But Alexander still allowed two in case of necessity, one for the dead and one of the day; and we know that St. Anselm, as prior of Bec, celebrated two such Masses daily. Local law enforced Pope Alexander's decree. In A.D. 1200 the Council of London decided that no priest may celebrate twice in one day except in case of necessity. Cardinal Langton a few years later explained the nature

²⁸ Sent., Lib. IV, dist. xii., n. 8.

of this necessity: "Let no one presume to celebrate twice a day except on Christmas Day and Easter, and if a corpse has to be buried, or if espousals have to be made, or the priest have to supply for another who is sick or necessarily absent. He who violates this prohibition without canonical necessity is suspended *ab officio*."²⁹ But in a few years Innocent III prohibited simple priests from saying more than one Mass a day, except on Christmas Day, when he might say three; his successor, Honorius III, extended this law to all dignitaries. Walafrid Strabo tells us that the pious faithful followed the same practice as their priests; "some believe that to communicate once a day, even though they are present at several Masses, is sufficient, on account of the dignity of the sacraments; others wish to communicate at all the Masses at which they are present." He considers neither party blameworthy.

(To be concluded)

²⁹ Wilkins, *Concilia*, I, 505, 531.

THE SCANDAL OF THE SAINTS¹

BY THE REV. STEPHEN RIGBY.

WHATEVER may be said of the rival theories for reconciling grace and free-will, this much is certain, that God is all and we are nothing. A convenient formula might run: "My will is free yet, if I am damned, I have myself alone to blame, whereas, if I am saved, I have God alone to thank." This mystery, for mystery it is, is the basis of truth and therefore of humility. If I do well, God rewards me, and yet I cannot take an iota of the credit to myself, as of myself; my sufficiency is from God. "When He rewards our merits, He but crowns His own gifts." Consequently, it is literally true for the saint to say he is no better than the veriest Judas that ever walked. "As of himself" he is, equally with Judas, nothing, and therefore is no better than Judas.

What is true of salvation is true of degrees of sanctification, though with a qualification. However holy a man may be, he has God and God alone to thank, but it does not follow that the less holy are less holy merely through neglect of grace. Granted that we must all confess to neglect of grace, it is inconsistent with Scripture to maintain that a lower degree of holiness is due merely to that neglect. "Star differeth from star in glory" partly because of neglect of grace, but also because the Spirit breatheth and divideth to everyone according to His will. Thus *The Imitation of Christ*²: "As they presumptuously undertook greater things than were pleasing to God, therefore they quickly lost grace. Needy did they become . . . who had built themselves a nest in heaven." So, too, *The Story of A Soul*: "God wished to create great saints and these we compare to roses and lilies; but He also created lesser saints and these *must be satisfied* with being daisies and violets that give joy to God when He looks down at them at His feet." Lest this be in danger of being read as a justification for quietism, it is easily checked by à Kempis' other words: "Love . . . would willingly do more than it can, complaineth not of impossi-

¹ In accordance with the decree of Urban VIII the writer protests he has no intention of anticipating the Church's decision in the matter of the sanctity of Guy de Fontgalland.

² Bk. 3, Ch. 7, Section 2. Cf. Whole of Chapter 3: 58.

bility, because it conceiveth that it may and can do all things." To blend the seeming contradictions there are St. Teresa of Lisieux's other words: "The simplest soul *that does not obstruct the grace of God*, shows forth the love of God as much as the highest soul."

The holy, therefore, have God and God alone to thank. God is the author of the Saints, as much as He is the author of our relatively little, but "it is a great thing to be even the least in heaven, where all are great; because all shall be called, and shall be, the children of God." The question is not one of the "psychology of the saints," but of the grace and ways of God. That hideous forbidding phrase "psychology of the saints" helps the heresy that the "saints," technically so called, are as remote as the angels. It confirms the average man in the blasphemous idea that Our Lord does not want his love in any deep sense. It creates an atmosphere completely different from that of the *Introduction to the Devout Life* and of *The Story of A Soul*, both of which books have commendation universal and supreme. If the usages of language permitted, the correct way to write a saint's life would be *never* to say, "the saint did this or that noble deed" but "God *gave* the saint to do this or that noble deed." Our Lady did not say "I have done great things"; She said: "He that is mighty hath done great things to me." The staggering simplicity of the Little Flower that scandalizes so many indicates the same thing: "If a floweret could speak, I think it would say simply *what God had done for it*. . . . It would not say, in mock humility, that it had neither beauty nor fragrance, that its freshness was dried by the sun, its stem broken by the wind, if it observed in itself a quite different state. Well, the flower that here undertakes to tell its story, rejoices to recite aloud *the gifts of Jesus and to confess that He freely bestowed every one of those gifts. Well does it know that of itself it had nothing to attract the eyes of Jesus and that it is the great mercy of God alone that heaped each good gift upon it.*"

It is because the grace of God is too little esteemed that, in the case of Saint Aloysius, for instance, in our revolt from the maudlin misrepresentation of him, we have gone to the opposite extreme of glorifying his human will. The truth is that but for the grace of God iron-willed Saint Aloysius might have been iron-willed Butcher Napoleon. There is a way of talking about "spinelessness never

making sanctity," as if natural strength of character were not as much a gift of God as supernatural strength of character. In fact, it is a legitimate interpretation of the weak chosen to confound the strong, of power made perfect in infirmity—it is a legitimate interpretation of the Pauline phrases to say that "spinelessness" *does* "make for sanctity." Are there not many naturally spineless characters who by grace have developed a very strong spine?

"Blessed is he whosoever shall not be scandalized in Me" and only by laying the emphasis on grace and the supernatural can one avoid being scandalized in Him as He manifests Himself in His saints. Alive to the cheap vilification to which his little hero might be subjected by the ignorant or the arrogant, Fr. McReavy, in his fine biography of Guy de Fontgalland is very anxious to draw a manly little fellow. Yet he seems torn asunder in his own mind trying to balance "boyishness" and "un-boyishness." He delights in Guy's boyish love for toys, but when it comes to vindicating his *unboyish* objection to fighting, he resorts to a sarcastic remark about "muscular Christianity" not having the authenticity of the Gospel. But surely this is arbitrary. Upon what basis are the separate judgments made? Is it not just as much grace that calls a child from childish things as it is grace that makes him turn the other cheek? Again, the author approves of the incident in which Guy chides his mother for the immodesty of her evening wear, yet finds it hard to believe that Saint Aloysius never looked in his mother's eyes—"for," he says, "I do not think the saints were freaks." But that is precisely what many of the saints are—divine freaks—for "God hath made foolish the wisdom of the wise and the wisdom of men is foolishness with God." In Fr. McReavy's own pungent phrase: "The saints are neither natural, nor unnatural; they are supernatural," and the modern attempt to naturalize them is as false as the former attempt to denaturalize them.

But Guy and the rebuke to his mother, and Aloysius refusing the eyes of his mother, are test cases in the question of the scandal of the saints. Guy cannot be airily dismissed by saying: "I should have boxed his ears"; and Aloysius cannot be dismissed by an appeal to human standards of freakishness. The majority of men are called

to serve God in a quiet and hidden way; to the "saints," technically so called, God gives charismata. One of Aloysius' charismata was an excessive (so to call it) love of the holy virtue; an excessive emphasis on modesty as the outer bulwark of internal purity. He was, as it were, a Divine Sandwichman³ advertising purity and modesty to a corrupt aristocracy that was flaunting impurity and had lost all concept of modesty. If God prepared him for that vocation by bidding him not meet even his own mother's eyes, it was through that very mother's training that He thus prepared him. The mother of Aloysius and the mother of Guy ought to be asked what *they* felt about things, the circumstances, the method employed, the "way" the thing was said or done. If we are to be scandalized at this freakishness, there is no logical reason for justifying the pill-box hat of Philip Neri and the numerous other examples of frantic freakishness out of the lives of numerous saints. Saint Aloysius may be unique in the degree to which he practised custody of the eyes, but it is well to remember that Juliana Falconieri would never look at a man, that Anna Maria Taigi would look at no man but her husband, that Francis of Assisi would look at only two women, Saint Clare and Jacoba di Settisoli. What Father Cuthbert says of Saint Francis well describes the attitude of Saint Aloysius and the others⁴: "For him the purity of a woman was a dower of humanity emanating from the purity of the Redeemer of

³ "The saint will be usually found exaggerating what the world has forgotten. Consequently he is looked upon as a poison, whereas he is an antidote."—*St. Thomas Aquinas*, by G.K.C.

⁴ Cf. the passage of S. John Chrysostom: "*In theatrum tamen ascendis ut commune genus virorum mulierumque contumelia afficias, oculosque deturpes? Ne mihi dixeris mulierem illam nudam esse meretricem; ubique idem ipse sexus, idem corpus est meretricis et liberae. . . . Quibus ergo te oculis uxor aspiciet, a tam iniquo spectaculo redeuntem? . . . quibus te verbis alloquetur qui muliebrem sexum totum ita dehonestaveris, et ex tali spectaculo captivus et servus meretricis effectus sis?*" (— In Matt. Hom. VI.) This is simply the doctrine of the solidarity of the female sex with the Mother of God, the solidarity of us all in the Mystical Body of Christ. If we should not tell lies because we are members one of another, it is abundantly clear that condonation of womanly immodesty wherever it appears is to insult Our Lady, to insult one's own mother, to insult any woman one reveres. The doctrine could not be stated more clearly than St. John Chrysostom here states it.

men. He would not dishonour their purity or sully his own by so much as a glance in which might possibly lurk some treacherous desire."

If the sin "the like of which is not among the heathens" (1 Cor. v.) had really never been heard of among Christians, God would not have needed to make Saint Aloysius a saint the like of which had never been heard of (*non est inventus similis illi*). He would not have prompted Aloysius to shirk his mother's gaze. But the children of light are so much less zealous than the children of this world that they are less shocked by sin refined to the subtlest of the fine arts than they are by virtues refined to the subtlest of the fine arts. They object to Lawrence Justinian "*excogitating*" new methods of self-torment; they do not object to the modern appalling mixture in vice of cunning and flagrancy. One is not asked to follow Aloysius in detail any more than one is asked to turn a ditch into a dressing-room and exchange shirt and trousers with the first beggar we meet, in emulation of the *Curé d'Ars*. But one is expected to see the divine wisdom behind the worldly folly. This much at least the *Curé* means, that it is better to be a divine gull than a wily old bird. This much at least Aloysius means, that when our spiritual leaders raise the alarm on the subject of his special virtue, their alarm is not to be explained away.

Cardinal Bourne raised the alarm at the Emancipation Congress in 1929. He felt it necessary to sound it again in the self-same words in his Lenten Pastoral for 1934: "The writers of books, the painters of pictures, the actors on the stage or for the screen, the women by the fashion of their dress, who render self-control more difficult for the average normal man or woman, and who, thereby, make the natural craving for sinful self-gratification more imperious than it would otherwise be, are doing moral evil and are committing sin in the sight of God. No silly prating about the necessity of elucidating problems, or that 'to the pure all things are pure,' or that the claims of art must be satisfied, which we frequently hear, can change the moral law, or alter the fundamental facts of human nature. No one can deny that around us there are many things, uncensored and unchecked, which are rendering the practice of continence, whether for the married or the unmarried, far more difficult than it ought

naturally to be for the normal average man and woman, while the allurements to vicious self-indulgence is proportionately increased."

After the Cardinal's death, the Vicar Capitular, in his Lenten Letter for 1935, reminded his flock of the "very grave words" the late Cardinal had said about "Modernism"—not in faith but in morals." Appealing to the example of Fisher and More he said they died "for the principle that there can be *no* compromise in matters of faith or of the moral code based upon, and arising necessarily from the faith; and that the sole and infallible guide and teacher as to both is the divinely appointed Vicar of Christ."

What the Vicar Capitular calls "Modernism in Morals" Dr. Fahey calls "Liberalism" in his two books *The Kingship of Christ* and *The Social Rights of Jesus Christ*, examining and condemning it in the light of Papal teaching.⁵ The "excessive" modesty of Aloysius, the precocious modesty of Guy de Fontgalland are not things at which to be scandalized, not things for which to apologize, but the divine counterpoise to the licentiousness of liberalism.

⁵The two books are part of a trilogy, the final one of which is to be *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World*.

COLLECTIVE SECURITY IN ST. AUGUSTINE

BY THE REV. J. P. WADSWORTH.

WHEN a man is faced with some difficult problem he turns naturally to his masters. The theologian consults his "approved authors," a sick man interviews his doctor, a lawyer starts searching for precedents. It is, or should be the same in politics. When a nation or civilization is in difficulties, it seems reasonable that it should look to its masters for guidance.

Europe, or more correctly European civilization, which is now almost the same as the civilized world, is to-day faced with an urgent problem; namely, how to secure peace. Europe then should look to its masters for guidance.

Europe has had many masters from Augustus to Napoleon, and in a more important sphere from Aristotle to Nietzsche. The men of action in their own lifetime may seem to fill the stage, but they have little meaning separated from the men of thought, and most historians will agree that ultimately it is the man of ideas who rules the world. Of all the thinkers who for better or worse have influenced European life, after our Lord Himself and St. Paul, none is greater than the African, St. Augustine of Hippo.

St. Augustine is probably the greatest man the West has produced—the true superman, not in the G. B. Shaw sense, but in that of St. Gregory the Great; he was of that small band *qui divina sapiunt, videlicet suprahomines sunt*. Like a giant Augustine stands out in history, and all most of us can do is to stare and admire. Men as far apart as St. Thomas Aquinas and Luther, Bossuet and Calvin, Rabelais and Harnack, Erasmus and Charlemagne, have all considered Augustine as their master. And the fact that he is quoted by more heretics than any other Doctor of the Church, is really a proof of his greatness. After all Christ's authority is claimed by *all* heretics.

If St. Augustine had been merely a theologian, his influence on Western thought would have been immense. But he was much more—he has a universality about him which makes the men of the Renaissance seem like modern specialists. Augustine's book *De Civitate Dei* supplied the intellectual background, the frame work and method, of mediæval Europe—a period of roughly a thousand years.

St. Augustine's *De Civitate Dei* was more than the inspiration of mediæval Europe. His influence was not merely that of later men, who taught a certain philosophy which once accepted logically produced certain political and economic conditions. Augustine did teach a philosophy, but he also taught a political system and an economic order. To understand Charlemagne and his ideas a thorough knowledge of St. Augustine's political theory is necessary, for Charlemagne was a man of action and he took his ideas from his master Augustine. The *De Civitate Dei* was Charlemagne's favourite reading, and he attempted to put into practice what he read there. St. Augustine is as accurately hailed as the founder of the Holy Roman Empire, as Karl Marx is of Soviet Russia, or Major Douglas of the Social Credit System. Thus did Augustine become the master of the Middle Ages.

The men of the Middle Ages realized fully the importance of this work of Augustine as a text-book. After the Bible no book was more frequently transcribed. Between 1467 and 1500 twenty editions came from our first printing presses—which means, over a period of thirty-three years a new edition every eighteen months. What modern best seller can equal this?

The practical result of this influence of St. Augustine was theoretically the Holy Roman Empire, actually it was Christendom. One may agree with Voltaire's sneer, that the Empire was neither Holy, nor Roman, nor an Empire, but no one can fairly deny that *Christendom* was a very real thing; that if individual kings were not prepared to acknowledge certain Emperors, all acknowledged some sort of moral overlordship. When a mediæval king defied both Pope and Emperor he always found some excuse. He never asserted absolute sovereignty; although he broke the law he acknowledged a common law of Christendom superior to his own

national laws; he always distinguished between the *lex aeterna* and the *lex temporalis*—a distinction which St. Augustine insists on.

The realization that the Emperor was the protector of the *lex aeterna* was perhaps never wholly present in the same way that the Middle Ages accepted the Divine authority of the Pope—but the essential idea of the unity of Christendom, all obeying certain immutable laws was a most real thing, which the frequent political chaos of the Middle Ages tends to hide. This conception of a supra-national law—a law of the nations superior to the law of the nation—was first formulated by St. Augustine. Of course, it was even in him not original; it was the result of his Catholicism and of Christ's teaching as he himself would have been the first to emphasize. The idea was also taught and urged by all the great mediæval Popes, but the more vigorously the Papacy urged the point, all the greater appears the genius of Augustine, who formulated and stated the truth four hundred years before it became a political reality, namely, when Pope Leo III crowned Charlemagne on Christmas Day, 800.

I have stressed this point of the importance of St. Augustine, because Europe seems to have forgotten its master. Of the thousands of speeches made at Geneva in connection with the present Italo-Abyssinian dispute, as far I know Augustine has never been mentioned. Perhaps this is not surprising, when Augustine's Master is never referred to, but it does seem strange that the man who influenced so much our civilization over a period of a thousand years should now be ignored. "Ignored" is perhaps the wrong word; one can understand the delegates ignoring Augustine, as they ignore the Pope—but what is more serious they do not know Augustine. Again and again it has been spoken and written during the last three months, that for the first time in history civilization is attempting collective security. "The League was founded to establish, what is without any precedent, the collective security of the nations." This quotation from the leader in the *Daily Telegraph* of November 13th is typical of what has been said and written hundreds of times recently. The astounding part is that it has never been contradicted. This is surely due to ignorance as well as to prejudice.

It is perhaps too much to expect of our modern politicians to ask them to read St. Augustine's *De Civitate Dei*. (If a voter at the recent general election had asked a candidate whether he had read it he would have been laughed at, yet such a question would have been much more reasonable and searching than thousands that were asked.) It is perhaps also waste of time to remind our politicians of the political theory behind the Holy Roman Empire—which surely was collective security built up on the *lex aeterna*. It is, however, quite reasonable to ask them to consider a few quotations from St. Augustine. First of all because he is our master. No matter what a man's theory of history is, he must admit that the present in some way depends on the past, and a thousand years of our past depended on St. Augustine. Further, if the world to-day is groping towards collective security it is surely worth while examining the principles which inspired and guided our last effort to that end. Whether the last effort failed or succeeded is strictly beside the point. And further, for a thousand years—in spite of apparent failure—thinking men considered those principles so true that they refused to surrender the ideal. Also there is something rather exhilarating in the thought of the greatest of Africans coming to the protection of his fellow-Africans after a period of fifteen hundred years. There is no doubt that he himself—apart from his political theory—would have been the first to defend them. In spite of his great admiration for Rome and the Empire, Augustine was always an African. His description of Hannibal in Book III of *The City of God* is one of the greatest national epics ever written.

To attempt a synopsis of St. Augustine's theory of the two cities is beyond the scope of this article. Indeed, the subject is so great, and because of its greatness so easy of misconception, that such an effort would be fair to nobody. But it is possible to try to discover what St. Augustine's opinion would be about the present problem that faces civilization. The authority of St. Augustine is worth that of all the present-day politicians put together. The present difficulties can be partly examined under the headings: imperialism, war, and collective security as a means to peace. St. Augustine considered them all *The City of God*.

St. Augustine's opinion on "imperialism" is easy to discover. The whole of Book III, in which he gives the history of the rise of Rome is one of the most terrible indictments of imperialism ever written. And, again, in Book IV, 3, he directly asks: "I should like first to inquire for a little what reason, what prudence, there is in wishing to glory in the greatness and extent of the Empire, when you cannot point out the happiness of men who are always rolling, with dark fear and cruel lust in warlike slaughter and in blood, which, whether shed in civil or foreign war, is still human blood; so that their joy may be compared to glass in its fragile splendour, of which one is horribly afraid lest it should be suddenly broken in pieces!"

In the next chapter (4) he quotes the anecdote borrowed from Cicero (*De Repul*, III): "Indeed that was an *apt and true* reply which was given to Alexander the Great, by a pirate who had been seized. For when that king had asked the man what he meant by keeping hostile possession of the sea, he answered with bold pride: 'What thou meanest by seizing the whole earth; because I do it with a petty ship, I am called a robber, whilst thou who dost it with a great fleet art styled emperor.' " If an Italian brought up before a court of law to-day for stealing, turned on his judges—who represent the State—and said: "I stole these few lire for the same reason as you are stealing a country—I am a thief, you who steal with a great army are the 'progress of civilization' "; St. Augustine would have been the first to shout: "Hear! hear!"

Again he writes: "To make war on your neighbours, and thence to proceed to others, and through mere lust of dominion to crush and subdue people who do you no harm, what else is this to be called but great robbery?" (Book IV, v. 6). Imperialist wars, then are as utterly and more sincerely condemned by St. Augustine than they are by modern pacifists.

His attitude to war is just as clear. He states it in Book XIX, v. 7. He first of all discusses the difficulty of different languages as a hindrance to peace, then proceeds: "But the imperial city has endeavoured to impose on subject nations not only her yoke, but her language, as a bond of peace. . . . This is true; but how many great wars, how much slaughter and bloodshed,

have provided this unity! And though these are past, the end of these miseries has not yet come. For though there have never been wanting, nor are yet wanting, hostile nations beyond the empire, against whom wars have been and are waged, yet, supposing there were no such nations, the very extent of the empire itself has produced wars of a more obnoxious description—social and civil wars—and with these the whole race has been agitated, either by the actual conflict or the fear of a renewed outbreak. If I attempted to give an adequate description of these manifold disasters, these stern and lasting necessities, though I am quite unequal to the task, what limit could I set? But, say they, the wise man will wage just wars. As if he would not all the rather lament the necessity of just wars, if he remembers that he is a man; for if they were not just he would not wage them, and would therefore be delivered from all wars. For it is the wrong-doing of the opposing party which compels the wise man to wage just wars: and this wrong-doing, even though it gave rise to no war, would still be matter of grief to man because it is man's wrong-doing. Let every one, then, who thinks with pain on all these great evils, so horrible, so ruthless, acknowledge that this is misery. And if anyone either endures or thinks of them without mental pain, this is a more miserable plight still, for he thinks himself happy because he has lost human feeling."

In this quotation St. Augustine seems to despair of ever establishing peace. And that indeed is his very point. He wishes to show that the mighty efforts of Rome to establish the Pax Romana were hopeless. That if man relies on paganism, that is on himself, there must be wars. However, he goes on to show how the City of God partly exists on earth—the *civitas terrena*; that this city had been silently growing since the coming of Christ—*crescit occulto velut arbor aevo*—and that if men would become citizens of the City of God on earth there is hope. Surely no truth needs promulgating more vigorously to-day than this one.

Further, St. Augustine shows in Book XIX, c. 17, that the means towards peace which the Romans thought necessary, unity of law, custom and language are not necessary to produce peace in the City of God on earth—modern history proves that the attempt to preserve peace

by forcing an alien language and law on a subject people is merely setting the seeds of future wars. He writes: "This heavenly city, then, while it sojourns on earth, calls citizens out of all nations, and gathers together a society of pilgrims of all languages, not scrupling about diversities in manners, law, and institutions whereby earthly peace is secured and maintained, but recognizing that, however various these are, they all tend to one and the same end, earthly peace. It therefore is so far from rescinding and abolishing these diversities, that it even preserves and adopts them, so long only as no hindrance to the worship of the one supreme and true God is thus introduced." This ideal, written fifteen hundred years ago, surely resembles that of the League of Nations.

The method suggested by Augustine for the preservation of this peace, based on the retention of local laws, customs and manners is also interesting. He denies in numberless places the pagan concept of absolute State sovereignty. He insists on the *lex aeterna* to which all are subject. So also any nation who has signed the Covenant of the League admits some sort of supranational common law, which is sufficient logically to destroy any claim to absolute sovereignty.

On the question of "sanctions," as they are understood at the moment, St. Augustine is perhaps not quite so explicit—not so explicit as was the practice of the Papacy and the Holy Roman Empire during the Middle Ages, who employed them frequently up to the failure of Pius V to have them applied against Elizabeth. But still the principle of sanctions is clearly taught in the *De Civitate Dei*. Actually for St. Augustine the question hardly arose because he insists again and again that collective security was impossible without universal recognition of the *lex aeterna*. In fact, the whole of Book III proves from history that collective security based on force is bound to fail.

Yet the principle on which our system of sanctions is built is quite clearly stated in Book XIX, 16: "And if any member of the family interrupts the domestic peace by disobedience, he is corrected either by word or blow, or some kind of just and legitimate punishment, such as society permits, that he may himself be the better for it, and be re-adjusted to the family harmony

from which he had dislocated himself. . . . Since then, the house ought to be the beginning or element of the city, and every beginning bears reference to some end of its own kind, and every element to the integrity of the whole of which it is an element, it follows plainly enough that domestic peace has a relation to civic peace—in other words, that the well-ordered concord of domestic obedience and domestic rule has a relation to the well-ordered concord of civic obedience and civic rule." Presumably the relationship can be logically carried one step further, to the world state—for according to Augustine the divisions of the *civitas terrena* are the family, the State, and collection of States each with its own customs, laws and manners which he suggests in Book XIX, c. 17 (quoted above).

At the beginning of this article it was suggested that Europe should in its present difficulties look to its master Augustine for guidance. Actually it seems that Europe has instinctively in its hour of trial gone back to its origins. It is said that a man in his death agony remembers his childhood, Europe has apparently done so. The one great hope for the future lies in this fact; that European instinct demands some sort of moral overlordship, and realizes that in that alone is there a chance of preserving peace and security. And this is more remarkable because it has been done so unconsciously. What Augustine saw so clearly fifteen hundred years ago, Europe is blindly groping towards to-day. It is true that there is much in the League of Nations with which Augustine would not agree, it is true that the League is attempting to make a human law do what only the *lex aeterna* is capable of, it is true that the League's headquarters are at Geneva—a name which stinks in Catholic nostrils—but if the nations will listen to Augustine and learn from him, if they will forget their absurd pride and realize that only God's law can rule men, it is possible that Europe will survive.

Mr. Hilaire Belloc has written: "Our Europe cannot perish. Her religion—which is also mine—has in it those victorious energies of defence which neither merchants nor philosophers can understand, and which are yet the prime condition of establishment. Europe, though she must always repel attacks from within and from without is always secure; the soul of her is a certain spirit, at once

reasonable and chivalric. And the gates of hell shall not prevail against her." Surely what is happening at present is a proof of Mr. Belloc's faith—that spirit at once reasonable and chivalric *is* working at present. It has still a long way to go to be as reasonable and as chivalric as Christ with the tool Augustine made it; and certainly it is too soon to cry with Charlemagne—*vivat vivat qui Francos diligit Christus!* But there is a gleam of light which may be the end of the tunnel—and when we have stumbled our way to the end we may find that we have been travelling *backwards* to Augustine from whence Europe started her great and glorious adventure fifteen centuries ago.

THE ESSENCE OF THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS

BY THE REV. C. LATTEY, S.J.

I HAVE studied Dr. Miller's article upon this subject in the November number of the *CLERGY REVIEW* with the care which his writings always deserve, and find myself in sympathy with a good deal of what he writes; but I also find a big difficulty in his views, which I may sum up clearly and briefly as an objection that they amount to an *evacuatio crucis*. It is not therefore primarily what he writes of the Mass that appears to me untenable, but what he writes upon the more fundamental question of the sacrifice of Calvary; an error in regard of this latter question inevitably has its repercussions upon the former.

His main argument begins with an objection against the sacrifice of Calvary which he acknowledges to be as old and simple "and, if you like as threadbare" as this: that Christ did not kill Himself (pp. 331-2). It is, he admits, "an argument that so many eminent theologians have disposed of to their satisfaction," though I doubt whether they would be altogether pleased with him for "vastly admiring their ingenuity" therein. Briefly, Christ's death is essential to the sacrifice of Calvary, but it is not essential that it should be inflicted by Himself; since it must be there to offer, it may be called a *conditio sine qua non*. Dr. Miller seems to admit this on pp. 333-4. "In all these sacrifices," he writes, "the victim is actually or virtually destroyed, though whether or no the priest who offers the sacrifice be also the destroyer of the victim, is a matter rather of liturgical custom or convenience than of necessity for the validity of the sacrifice." I may add as an illustration the sacrifice of the paschal lamb in New Testament times, as described in the Mishna in its treatise on the passover.¹ I quote Dr. Danby's translation:

¹ *Pesachim*, v. 6.

An Israelite slaughtered his [own] offering, and the priest caught the blood. The priest passed the bason to his fellow, and he to his fellow, each receiving a full bason and giving back an empty one. The priest nearest to the Altar tossed the blood in one action against the base [of the Altar].²

Here the layman killed the victim, but the priest nearest the altar offered the sacrifice.

Dr. Miller's view, I take it, is that Christ was *always* offering Himself. "His whole life was an offering. His sacrifice was one perfect act, never retracted, never interrupted (so that it might be called an active state or condition), which from time to time was outwardly manifested by various actions that, by means of His own intention, were ritually connected and unified. This is not mere theory. It follows immediately from data that are commonplaces in Catholic theology" (p. 334). I confess to no little curiosity about these *data*, whether from Scripture or Tradition. It appears to me that there is some danger of ambiguity in speaking of Christ's continual "self-offering." No doubt He always intended to accomplish the Divine Will, but can we call this an "offering" in the strict sense? He was not always handing Himself over, as it were to God, nor is it obvious that any such thought was always in His mind. It formed no necessary part of His perfect conformity to the Divine Will.

And what would Dr. Miller suppose Him to be always offering? He does not seem to allow in any sense that Christ was offering His *death*. The day of Calvary was merely "the great day when this perpetual self-oblation was given its fullest and most perfect manifestation, beyond which even Christ could not go, when from the excess of His love He publicly manifested His full self-offering by giving Himself into His enemies' hands, allowing them to shed His blood even unto death. To this death, the perfection of sacrifice because made visible in the most perfect way, He wished the benefits of redemption to be in a special way connected" (p. 335).

Thus Calvary is merely the most perfect manifestation of a self-offering that is always being made, which self-offering is the essential sacrifice. In what way then are "the benefits of redemption to be in a special way

² Oxford, 1933, p. 142,

connected with Calvary"? That is the whole crux of the matter, but Dr. Miller does not explain the point.

"In his action," he writes a little farther on, "we find verified all the notes that, according to the foregoing, make up the essence of a perfect sacrifice. It is the complete offering to God, by a priest as an act of religion, of a visible victim, that aptly manifests and symbolizes the sacrificer's perfect inward self-offering" (p. 336).

But here, surely, we have a single definite act, not the perpetual self-offering, a single act demanding "a visible victim," which on Dr. Miller's own showing (p. 334) must be destroyed. It is by being the priest of His own sacrifice, the priest-victim, that Christ accomplishes a perfect self-offering, inward and outward.

Such was the High Priest fitted for our needs—holy, guileless, undefiled, set apart from sinners and made higher than the heavens, who hath not need daily, like the high priests, to offer sacrifice first of all for his own sins, and then for those of the people: for this latter he did once for all when he offered himself.³

I quote Canon Boylan's translation in the Westminster Version. In the course of his note he writes: "Jesus offered sacrifice for the people—but He did so once for all." This translation, "once for all," is the only one given for *ephapax* in Liddell and Scott, and there can be no serious doubt that it is the right one. I find it a little difficult to take seriously Dr. Miller's explanation of it: "He offered Himself once, by an irrevocable act which, beginning with the Incarnation, did not cease with its supreme manifestation on Calvary, but continues still" (p. 337). I find no difficulty in supposing that, the sacrifice of Calvary once offered, Christ continues to offer it in Heaven and in the Mass; but He does not repeat the sacrifice of Calvary itself. Nor, one would naturally gather from the text, was He offering it "daily" during His life on earth.

Surely Scripture and Tradition speak precisely of Christ's death on Calvary as the single redeeming sacrifice. Dr. Miller has not quoted the passage from the epistle to the Hebrews (ix. 13-14) which seems to me the most important in this regard:

³ Hebrews vii. 26-27.

For if the blood of goats and bulls and the sprinkled ashes of a heifer sanctify the unclean unto purity of flesh, how much more will the blood of Christ, who through his eternal spirit hath offered himself unblemished unto God, purify our conscience from dead works unto the service of the living God?

This connection of redemption with the shedding of Christ's blood is also expressed in Ephes. i. 7 and elsewhere, but it may suffice to quote Romans v. 10: "If when we were enemies we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son, all the more, once reconciled, shall we be saved by his life."

I shall not labour the argument from Tradition. It may be enough to mention that the Council of Trent begins its explanation of the sacrifice of the Mass by saying that Christ "was about to offer Himself to God the Father once on the altar of the cross by means of His death (*morte intercedente*), in order that He might effect for them eternal redemption."⁴ And to come to the sense of the faithful, we are all familiar with the invocation: "We adore Thee, O Christ, and we bless Thee, because by Thy holy cross Thou hast redeemed the world."

I hope I have said enough to present my difficulty clearly, and at the same time respectfully, to such a tried veteran in theology. His view appears to me to be of French origin, but as he has not discussed the point, neither shall I.

⁴ Session 22, chap. 1: Denzinger, *Enchiridion*, no. 938.

HOMILETICS

BY THE REV. C. C. MARTINDALE, S.J.

Fourth Sunday after Epiphany. First Sunday in February.

"Lord, save us; we perish!" (Matthew viii. 25).

1. Human "frailty."
2. Modern instability.
3. Shallow vision, hence lack of interest.
4. "Lord, save us!"

The sermons for the last three Sundays in this month fall into a group, for they are proper to Septuagesima, Sexagesima and Quinquagesima. But it would be an affectation to force this Sunday's liturgy into connection with that of the next three, if only because the fourth Sunday after Epiphany comes only accidentally, this year, just before Septuagesima, and is not meant to prepare us for the little "purple" period that leads up to Lent and prepares us for that, even as Lent prepares us to celebrate Easter properly. We can interrelate the next three sermons, but this one must stand separately. Moreover, we cannot, even within this sermon, connect the Epistle with the Gospel! There, is, however, one word, and idea, which recurs twice in this Sunday's liturgy—*fragilitas*—and since, though far from unusual in the Missal taken as a whole, it is sufficiently unusual in itself, certainly if you find it twice in one Mass you are expected to attend to it; and it, assuredly, fits in well with one of the lessons of the Gospel.

The Collect says: "God, who knowest that we, placed amongst such dangers, because of our human frailty can find no foothold, save us in mind and body, so that what we are suffering because of our sins, we may, by Thy help, conquer." The Silent Prayer asks that our "fragility" may ever be purged from all evil, and protected (from any further disasters). The Offertory is correspondingly optimistic and attributes strength where strength is due: "The hand of the Lord hath worked power! the hand of the Lord hath set me on high! I shall not die, but live, and relate the works of the Lord!"

The Collect fits obviously in with the story of the storm in the Gospel, where the Apostles certainly could find no foothold, and, with the tossing sea all round them, were—almost paradoxically—*established* in the midst of perils—their position was inescapable; their efforts were as weak as the timbers of their boat.

The direct lesson of the Gospel is, of course, faith in our Lord, and His proven saving power. But I venture to insist on this unpalatable fact of man's "fragility," brittleness; and when people boast about being "hard-boiled," well, a hard-boiled egg can be just as easily crumbled as a soft one can be squashed. School teachers tell us that children are as clever, and even as good, as they used to be, but can concentrate far less. We keep meeting young fellows of the poorer classes who

get all-important jobs and *cannot hold them down*, for the reason that they vaguely get "fed up." Possibly we ourselves feel, to our shame, that it is very difficult to endure anything that lasts a very long time; and, grateful as we are to those who assist us in doing something we want done, we keep discovering how soon they get tired of it, begin to come late, or break appointments, and *give up*.

You, then, are you willing to do anything for Christ at all? If you are not, how are you Christian-wise alive at all? For, if you are Christians, you are co-corporate with Christ, as St. Paul says; and if you are *that*, well, you are alive with Christ's life. But what is alive, is active. You recognize Life by Activity. And if Christ is alive—as again St. Paul says—for *evermore*, you must be active at least *continuously*. You must be able to be continuously active along with Him: perseveringly so. It is easy enough to undertake some good work: but very difficult to keep up with it. Very soon, we display some symptom of modern instability. Men cannot answer letters—let alone, *at once*. They cannot stick to things, let alone, for long together. Young Catholics make promises, and then, suddenly, they find that a dance, or a cocktail party, has interfered with them. This is serious: it means a loss of grip upon oneself, or never having had one.

The English are said to be sentimental, where Latins are passionate: impressionable, not logical. All the same, they used to be proud of their "staying power"—not but what we are beginning to look for "tenacity" almost more among women than among men. I would not dare to say that more marriages, to-day, are dissolved in which it is the girl's fault rather than the man's; and if it is the man's fault, it seems to be oftener due to a kind of "loss of interest" rather than to a tremendous temptation. When religious vocations "fade out," I find that this seems rather because ideals have disappeared, than because of any definite disapprobation of the religious life as such, or of this or that Order in particular, or even a clear vision both of personal character and of the religious state and a reasonable conviction that the two are not suited to one another. And if you find a man who has given up his faith, how very seldom any real "reason" can be alleged, arguing that his Creed had been false! Far more often the "fade-out" has been quite vague, and suggests that the victim was just involved in a way of acting and talking, till he found he had grown tired of it. Then it ceased to hold him—he had never held it.

Few people realize that there is very nearly a "law" in all human enterprises: they begin with some enthusiasm, and perhaps success: then there comes a "slump." Character displays itself not least in the power of surviving this slump. Getting through the "dud" period. Coming out at the other side, perhaps not quite at so high a peak as that from which the descent was made; but at no base level, and with the reward

of being infinitely better in grain, in fibre, than the character would have been had it never had the bad patch to weather.

There are very many causes for our instability. One is, that the world is now full of such a number of things, that instead of us all being "as happy as kings," as Stevenson said, we do not care for any of them *very much*. If I lose one of them, there are dozens more to turn to. And, again, things go so much faster than they did, that we practically never pause nor go "deep" into anything. We skim pleasantly over experiences, but do not "fathom" any one of them. Hence not only we should find it difficult to commit ourselves "deeply" to anything, but we are not acquiring "depth" of character or personality enabling us to do anything "deeply." Hence I am not too sorry when I see someone really "up against it," as they say. Really not sure of his next day's meal or next night's bed. That ought not to go on for too long, else the man may be broken or become unscrupulous. But until one's spirit has been "stabbed wide awake," we are unlikely to care for anything sufficiently to stick to it in all imaginable circumstances and against all odds. The martyrs did that: you could not be martyred for something about which you were not so very sure, or for which you did not particularly care.

We have then to ask our Lord to make us see how, despite social or financial security, we are really being swept or tossed over just so deep a sea as the apostles were, with very frail planks between us and character-death, let alone eternal loss. I *must* then get quick as I can to confession, to get the "dope" out of me which hinders me from so much as seriously trying to sail my ship: a drugged man at the tiller! And more important still, I must hasten to my Communion, to get strength into me! A weakling at the oar! I can take one pull and then another—but can I *go on* till the shore is reached? Not without *His* strength, by means of which I "can everything."

Septuagesima.

"*But with most of them, God was not well pleased*" (from the Epistle).

"*For many are called, but few are chosen*" (from the Gospel).

1. Man's sin : God's mercy.
2. God displeased with *most* of Israel.
3. The Husbandman's generosity to *all* the Vintagers.
4. Many called, few chosen.

We pass to-day definitely into the short period that prepares us for Lent. During Lent, you will find that two great dogmas are taught—first, the fact that man has sinned, and its consequence, that man by his own efforts or merits cannot possibly put himself right with God; and, second, the fact that God is merciful, that He freely pardons, and in His goodness goes far beyond merely cancelling our fault. The Liturgy for

to-day already puts these two complementary ideas before us.

The Collect for this Sunday begins by acknowledging that we are *justly* beaten down because of our sins, but asks, that we may *mercifully* be freed. The Collect for the Tenth Sunday after Pentecost says: "O God, who showest forth Thine Almightyness *chiefly* in sparing, and having mercy"—but you cannot "spare" nor "show mercy" to one who does not deserve the opposite. In every Mass, the Priest prays that we may be admitted into the company of Apostles and Martyrs not because God has "reckoned up" our merits, but because He "makes largesse of pardon"—*veniae largitor*.

The Epistle stresses the sterner half of this double doctrine. We omit on this occasion the striking lines with which it begins, about the necessity not only of running, but of training, if you wish to win the prize offered for a race, and examine what St. Paul says about the history of the Jews.

They had, says he, remarkable privileges—shadowy ones compared with ours, but very substantial ones compared with those granted to the pagans around. They were all immersed, so to say, in the mysterious Cloud, but they passed through the Red Sea and came out undrowned—nay, they emerged a People as never they had been before. They all ate the "bread from heaven," the Manna which they believed to have fallen out of the sky: they all "drank from the Rock"—not merely the rock that Moses struck and from which water flowed, but, from the Rock of Israel, the Messiah, who kept pace with them during their slow history, even as He was intended to be its consummation. In a word, they all had their appropriate baptism and Communion. None the less, with the most of them, God was ill-pleased. It is true that our Epistle stops, as so often, in the middle of an argument, if not of a sentence. But so far as it goes, it has a double point. "The Israelites had many supernatural privileges of which they made no proper use, so that God was ill-pleased with them though it was He who had chosen them and given them those privileges. And, the Israelites are an anticipatory picture of ourselves."

Disconcerting, assuredly! One might be tempted to cry out: "Who, then, *can* be saved?" God was displeased with the majority of the Chosen People itself. . . . They ended, "by a majority," in rejecting their Saviour, and have been themselves rejected.

The Gospel arrives as a corrective.

The Master of a vineyard summons men to work in it. Later, he thrice summons others—some, at the working-day's last hour. Yet, when it is time for them to be paid off, all receive exactly the same wage. (That the actual payment starts with the last-comers is a detail introduced purely for the story's sake: otherwise, the first-comers would have taken their wage and gone off, not knowing how much the last men received.) The story is a parable, not an allegory: not each and every detail

has a spiritual counterpart. The direct meaning is, I suppose, that the Gentiles, who had not been called till "late in the day," none the less received a reward in no way less than that granted to the faithful Jews despite their long history. There are, however, those who do not see any allusion to Jew v. Gentile in this parable, and we need not fear to miss the moral doctrine of the parable if we do not attend to that particular application, for in any case we may suppose that our Lord meant to supply *also* a moral doctrine by means of this story.

He insists that God is "free"—not to act unjustly, as the husbandman would have done had he "agreed" to pay a certain wage and then gone back on it, upon the grounds that the last comers had worked for but so little—but, to do better than to act according to strict justice, and is, in fact, unbelievably merciful. Certainly the Hebrews were forgiven again and again; but in Christianity everything outstrips even mere forgiveness. "Not as the sin, so the grace!" There is no question of a sort of arithmetical cancelling out: the gift of Grace is a positive. St. Paul is full of words like "over-brimming"—"super-forth-exuberantly"—and other compound words that he invents to show that there is simply no proportion between work done and reward lavished. "More than we deserve," says the Church; and "more even than we desire": "Who in the abundance of Thy loving-kindness dost go beyond not only the merits of Thy supplicants but their very prayers," says the Collect for the eleventh Sunday after Pentecost: "pour out Thy mercy upon us, so as to dismiss what our conscience fears, and so as to add what our prayer dare not to ask." How *should* it ask—seeing that "it hath not entered into the heart of man to conceive" the good things that God has prepared for them that love Him!

St. Matthew surprisingly ends with the proverb (to be found in various shapes in more than one civilization): "Many are called, but few are chosen." Surprisingly, because all the labourers were called, and all were chosen in the sense that all were paid. Perhaps St. Matthew's mind shifted slightly towards the thought that the whole race of the Jews were called, but few were chosen, i.e., willing to accept the grace of God and believe. This would have been true, but not deducible from the actual story of the labourers. The tremendous lesson holds good, that God is master of His gifts, and free to give more than is strictly just, though never less.¹

¹ I tend to think that the final verse of chapter xix.—"The last shall be first, and the first, last"—should be attached to the beginning of this chapter xx.; it is identical with xx. 16/a, and the two together would make a sort of antiphon and be very appropriate. Verse 16/b, "Many are called, etc.", cf. xxii. 14, may have come into the head of St. Matthew for some such reason as we suggested above, and have been written here too, strictly speaking, out of its place, either by himself, or by the translator of his Aramaic gospel into Greek, if he did not make that translation himself

The thought is very serious. The mere belonging to the Chosen People did not suffice. "Say not, 'We have Abraham to our father!' Show the works of Abraham." "Not everyone that sayeth to Me: 'Lord, Lord,' shall enter. . . ." Why, we may have been within the very Vineyard and not worked at all, or even, have injured the Vine. I could never put that right. But God wishes to forgive me, and can forgive me, and rectify the wrong, and give me that Grace which I could never earn, had I worked day and night at my very best, but which must be my better-than-reward, my free Gift, whereby I am saved.

Sexagesima.

"Strength is made perfect in weakness" (from the Epistle).

"They bring forth fruit in patience" (from the Gospel).

1. St. Paul's "sufficiency" was from God.
2. Though the soil of my soul be "insufficient," God can produce this hundred-fold from it.
3. Bringing forth fruit "in patience."

In our last sermon, we said that the Epistle taught a stern and almost alarming doctrine, and the Gospel provided a corrective. Here, in a certain sense, it is the other way round. True, the Epistle leaves one, may be, slightly uncomfortable: we feel as though no one ought to have boasted (it is his own word) quite so much as St. Paul did. We know that he was being forced to defend himself against critics, who were telling his Corinthian converts that he was no true Apostle, had no apostolic credentials and so forth. But even though the words, refuting this, come torrentially from his lips, he pulls himself up more than once, and trembles to allude to himself save as "a man I know of," and ends by emphasizing that "thorn for his flesh" which, whatever it may have been, left him feeling so personally helpless and weak, that he could have no doubt at all but that his "sufficiency was from God." The Collect for Sexagesima anticipates this, and tells God that He "sees clearly"—has a comprehensive view of the fact that we put our trust in no action whatsoever of our own.

Now you, dear brethren, when the Gospel for to-day is read to you, are likely to feel that, from the point of view of the Sower, you are not at all good soil. That is just what St. Paul felt about himself, and, in a sense, he was right. Every man carries about within himself the *bad version* of his better self. St. Paul *could* have been a very self-centred, tyrannical, ill-tempered man. It would not be difficult to make a list of his "weaknesses." But, as he says, Strength is made perfect *in* weakness. If we were very perfect people naturally, we would not see so clearly how it is God's grace that is triumphing in us.

Now recall what the Gospel says. The Sower goes forth to

sow,
and
seed
at o
grow
rest
max
of a
God

Ar
a cr
as a
pay
aver
they
that
of y
but
in f
inse
plea
man
out
ever
harc
"m
bear
me
does

In
und
selv
min
mas
tem
thou
into
last
man

S
one
hop
Wel
of t
abs
pos
so l
they
jud
"n
not

sow, and some of his grain falls on the trodden path, bounces and rolls abouts, and is at once pecked off by the birds. More seed falls upon thin soil merely: it shoots up, and withers almost at once. Some more fall in places where other rough strong growths come up along with it and suffocate it. Finally, the rest falls on good soil, but even so, not all of it produces the maximum results hoped for. It looks as though, by the law of averages, I am far more likely to provide useless soil for God's word and work, than good (let alone perfectly good) soil.

Any priest, speaking to an average congregation like you, i.e., a crowd of people who will not be indignant if they are described as a mixed lot, and few among them absolutely first-rate (I pay you the compliment—for such it is—of assuming that average people, like you and me, are not so deluded as to imagine they are one hundred per cent. first-rate), must feel at times that his words are getting nowhere. There are at least some of you who are, I fear, rather unimpressionable. They listen, but "it doesn't interest them." The modern pagan world is in fact rather proud of being "hard-boiled," as they say; insensitive, as St. Paul put it. I once heard a mother, being pleaded with for her children's sake not to go off with another man, use this ghastly expression: "I don't get any more *kick* out of the children." She had become absolutely callous to everything that did not give her the momentary thrill. Well, *hardness* may be your "weakness." Spiritual things, you own, "mean nothing to you." You are, then, totally insufficient to bear fruit. But even so, God, of His free goodness, *can* make me bring forth any amount of fruit—"in patience." What does that word mean?

In the Greek, the word means, literally, a state of "remaining under" something. You can, God helping you, submit yourselves to what you know to be right, slogging away at your minimum religious duties; seeing, or feeling, no point in them; masticating the hard crusts of faith; at least not yielding to temptation. This is a very good sort of hardness. It is as though the hard-trampled path after all did clasp the grain into itself and hug it tight, and keep it loyally till at long, long last it begins to produce its stem, and then the ear, and then the manifold new wheat.

Sometimes, again, a priest, looking at his people, may see one or two of whom he cannot but say to himself: "She is hopelessly frivolous. He is absolutely superficial!" Thin soil. Well; yes, and no. Frivolous, shallow, deluded by every fashion of the moment in dress and talk—but not hopelessly so! not absolutely so! There are depths in everyone; solid stability is possible to everyone. Quite possibly there are those who are so happy-go-lucky, or so much the victims of their moods, that they are "never the same two days together," that you would judge that no great thing can be expected from *them*. Perhaps "no great thing," according to human estimates. But not *nothing*; possibly something very valuable in its line. After

all, mustard and cress can be sown on flannel, though an acorn cannot. But mustard and cress is quite a nice thing in its way; it is pleasant to have in your salad, though it will never grow into anything that would need oak to make it! So even if you think you are shallow in nature or character, do not despond. If you go on giving your heart to God, He will produce something very valuable from your lives, if you let Him take His time, and do not expect fruit otherwise than "in patience."

What is perhaps more likely is, that nine-tenths of your life is taken up with the job of every day; the ordinary hours of work; the ordinary conversation surrounding you *at work*; the real responsibilities that beset a young father or mother—roof, clothes, food, warmth . . . and really it is not astonishing if the remaining one-tenth of life be packed as full of "amusement" as it can be. I quite see how delicate, invisible, spiritual things can quite well be choked out of your existence. Now external affairs cannot exactly be a "weakness," though they may be weakening, in this sense, that they leave me no energy of body or mind to attend to anything else. And, of course, the moment I begin to think of them as all-important, I become almost helpless in regard of the things that really *are* endlessly important. But there are those who say, and say sincerely: "I can't help it! I really am—and it is my duty to be—so taken up with earning a living for myself and my family, that I have no strength of brain, let alone time, let alone (most certainly) money, for attending to religious things or doing anything about them." Well, that is a "weakness," but a much more hopeful one than that of those who *like* the external affairs—and there are men who can enjoy their "business" quite as much as others enjoy pleasures—who like them, then, so much that they are only too glad to snatch at them as excuse, for example, for not saying their morning or night prayers. Ah! don't do that! No one is ever too tired to say *something* short, but sincere! Contact with God! Rapid deep breath of the true air, quite preventing suffocation! Be "patient"! Endure. Give a rapid God-ward gasp, and the divine Spirit will fill your soul's lungs and you will not be suffocated.

There is a lovely parable in St. Mark which nobody save he relates. It too has to do with fields and grain and growth, and assuredly with patience! But here it is the patience of the fieldsman. He sows his grain; it disappears into the earth; and the field looks as though it had nothing in it. He goes home; the days pass; the sun rises and sets, the rains fall; he himself wakes, sleeps, and waits. All of a sudden, from the earth that looked so unpromising, a million little shoots have risen, and there is certainty of a noble harvest.

If last Sunday taught the lesson of Mercy passing beyond Justice, this Sunday may teach the divine Strength predominant over all human weakness.

"T
may
"V

1. T
2. W
3. W
4. B

If
pure
summ

Our
neces
death
prop
over
scou
That
bear
coul
unde
they
be b
chee
who
it w
bega
The
he '
the
wan
at c

T
men
do
shu
ban
doc
be
to.
Isa
Goe
the
Pet
"T
His
V
the

Quinquagesima.

"*They understood nothing of these things.*" "*Lord that I may see!*" (from the Gospel).

"*We now see . . . darkly*" (from the Epistle).

1. The Apostles could not "understand" the Passion-prophecies.
2. We may be self-blinded; but others, who seem so, may not be.
3. We see God now at best "by means of a mirror," indirectly.
4. But we see Him the more clearly in proportion as we love Him the more dearly.

If the two preceding Sundays have as it were epitomized the purely penitential part of Lent, this one may be thought of as summarizing that part of Lent which is strictly Passiontide.

Our Lord had reached a point in His life when He felt it necessary to prepare the Apostles in an explicit way for His death and apparent defeat. Backing His words, so to say, with prophecy, He declared that the Son of Man must be handed over to the pagans, be scourged and spat upon, and, after being scourged, be killed, and three days later He must rise again. That seems so clear that one hardly sees how it could possibly bear any meaning save one. Yet how St. Luke insists that He could not make Himself understood! "As for them, they understood no word of this: the thing was hidden from them: they could not understand what was being said." It cannot be by accident that without further comment St. Luke places cheek by jowl with this episode the miracle of the blind man who was cured. He heard the crowd passing by and asked what it was. They told him—Jesus from Nazareth is passing by. He began to call out: "Jesus, Son of David, have pity on me." The men at the head of the throng told him to keep quiet. But he "shouted out all the more." Jesus heard; stood still; caused the blind man to be brought to Him, and asked him what he wanted. "Lord, that I may see." Our Lord cured him, and at once the man, who had received his sight, followed Jesus.

The first difference to be observed here, perhaps, is between men who cannot see, but want to; and men who cannot, but do not want to see. I am not saying that the Apostles guiltily shut their eyes to Christ's meaning: ten thousand inherited bandages were upon their eyes. They could not assimilate the doctrine that the Saviour-King should suffer ignominy, let alone be made a victim of the heathen. But neither did they want to. They would have been appalled to find that undoubtedly Isaiah, at least, had prophesied the sufferings and death of God's Anointed Servant: they would have been in torment had they been forced to contemplate the doom of their dear Master. Peter himself, but recently established as the Rock, exclaimed "That be far from Thee!" when Christ proceeded to prophecy His own Passion.

We have to be very careful not to accuse men of blinding themselves when they stare at and cannot see things so obvious

to us, such as the truth of our Faith : all the same, even though in a sense they *cannot* take their blinkers off, they may very well not *want* to, seeing somewhere deep down within themselves that if they did see, they would incur very grave material disaster, as, say, a clergyman would who was fit for nothing save his special work, and would ruin not only himself but his wife, and be unable to educate his children, did he become a Catholic, especially if they had no wish to do so themselves. "Charity thinketh no wrong," till it is absolutely forced to do so. But we ourselves, in the moral sphere, may indeed be self-blinded and *not know* it. There are those who cannot see that they are taking utterly illegitimate moral risks, even though, mixed up with this, is the strong desire not to be prevented from doing what I want to do. If we are afraid we are in that condition, we have to pray, and pray doggedly, that we may receive our sight, whatever it may be that we shall have to look at. It is possible that God sometimes refrains from giving us more sight, lest we should not have the courage to act according to our new vision.

The Epistle also has important things to say about "seeing." We see, it says, "by means of a mirror," dimly : "but *then* face to face. *Now*, I know but in part : then, I shall know even as I *am* known."

The dogma enshrined in this is, the obvious fact that we do not see God directly now at all : and the revealed fact, that so to see Him is what He intends that we should do hereafter. I fancy that most readers think that the words mean that we somehow see God as one sees the sun, through smoked glass, during an eclipse. No. The "glass" is a mirror ; and to see "through" it means to see by means of it. "Darkly" means in a dim, indirect way. It might be straining the metaphor to recall that ancient mirrors very seldom were perfectly smooth, and did, as a rule, somewhat distort what they reflected. As it is, we see God not in Himself, but "in His works," which in various degrees reflect His power and wisdom and love. The Book of Wisdom actually says, very nearly, that if in times past men were so overwhelmed by the marvels of creation, that they actually thought they were gods—well, they were almost forgivable : but let them reflect how still more powerful and beautiful must He be, who made them. St. Paul recalls this in his Epistle to the Romans, and goes so far as to say that men are "inexcusable" if they do not rise from the sight of God's works to the sure knowledge that God exists, and to much about His nature. Again, speaking to the Lystrians, he insists that God has never left Himself without a sufficient witness ; and says elsewhere that He has made men "of one blood over all the earth," that we might grope after Him, if haply they might find Him. It remains that we do *not* see God face to face, but are called to accept His supernatural grace that shall enable us to do so. "We shall be like Him," says St. John, "for we shall see Him as He is."

Meanwhile, we can say without any sentimentalism that what helps us to "see" God better than anything else is, a loving heart. St. Paul, in this lyrically lovely passage of the first Epistle to the Corinthians, does without doubt intend, first, to speak of *supernatural* charity, and the mysterious saving gift whereby we love God for His own sake. But as the passage proceeds, I think he passes into the description of the loving heart as such. "It believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things." It sees something in one's neighbour—something underneath all that is superficial and even repulsive; and that innermost is the presence of God Himself and of our Lord—either present there by grace or desiring so to be present. And without irreverence, we may say that that is how God in His eternity looked at us. "We love Him, because He *first* loved us"; and, "While yet we were sinners, Christ died for us." Moreover, even when we sin again, He continues to love us and would, were it thinkable, die again for us. His insight, then, finds in us something that He can love; and, though no one else may be able to see it, He can.

Unable, then, to endure the Beatific Vision in this life, let us at least pray and pray again to see as much as we can; and what we can, depends very largely on how much God enables us to love.

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

I. DOGMATIC THEOLOGY.

BY THE VERY REV. CANON G. D. SMITH, D.D., Ph.D.

*The Spirit and the Bride*¹ is Abbot Vonier's response to many requests for a book on the Holy Ghost. Rightly he became "convinced of the futility of treating of the Holy Ghost without at the same time speaking of the Church; it would be tantamount to giving a theological exposition on the Second Person of the Trinity without mentioning the Incarnation." The Holy Ghost therefore appears in this work as the Spirit manifesting Himself in the Church, decking her out as the fitting Bride for the Son of God. The Spirit is invisible; but this is not to say that He is not manifest. Indeed, it was characteristic of His coming at Pentecost that from the very beginning He showed His full power and majesty, whereas in the case of the Son that full manifestation will not be reached until the day of judgment. The Church, then, is the outward sign of the presence of the Holy Spirit within her. This is the keynote of Abbot Vonier's book. The Church is now already the Bride of Christ; we shall expect to find in her, therefore, all those endowments which manifest her before the eyes of the world as the divine Spouse; her whiteness, her manifold glories, her riches. The author has "noticed with a feeling of pain how several recent books by Catholic writers make a distinction that is a surrender to Protestant feeling between the ideal Church and the real Church." To the pusillanimous attitude of such apologists he contrasts the teaching of the Vatican Council concerning the "admirable extension, the exceeding sanctity, the inexhaustible stability" of the Church, by reason of which she "is a great and everlasting motive of credibility and a witness to her divine mission that cannot be gainsaid."

The chief difficulty, of course, is constituted by the presence of sinful members in the Church. How can these be reconciled with a sanctity described by St. Paul as "not having spot or wrinkle"? The Abbot answers that the sanctity of the Church is not the sanctity of innocence. "It is . . . the uninterrupted presence of the spirit of repentance that makes the metaphor of whiteness a true metaphor in the case of the Church on earth. . . . The whiteness of the Church, in the words of St. Paul, is a whiteness obtained through the unceasing action of the Spouse of the Church, the action of sanctifying and cleansing" (pp. 94-95). Hence the classical description of St. Paul is to be applied, not to the Church in glory merely, but to the Church on earth, which alone the Apostle had in mind. "That whiteness and that youth are the whiteness and the youth of the Church at the present time. . . . Christ has the power to bring it about" (p. 95).

¹ Burns Oates & Washbourne. 1935. 6s.

The whole of this chapter, "The Bride's Whiteness," is an eloquent commentary on the words of the Catechism: "The Church is holy because she teaches a holy doctrine, offers to all the means of holiness, and is distinguished by the eminent holiness of so many thousands of her children." Nevertheless, we confess to not sharing the author's repugnance to the distinction between the real Church as it is here on earth—the net in which both good and bad fishes are caught, the field in which there is cockle as well as wheat, the building from which the wood, hay and stubble have not yet been burnt away—and, on the other hand, the Church as it will be in glory. In particular we do not think that those Catholic authors are to be blamed who interpret St. Paul's encomium of the Church in the epistle to the Ephesians as referring primarily to the Church in glory. Their interpretation is not a new one. To say nothing of St. Thomas (*Summa Theol.*, III, Q. 8, art. 3, ad 2) or of more recent commentators, they might appeal with confidence to St. Augustine who would vindicate them without question. For him the "glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle," is not the Church on earth but the Church in glory. Everyone will admit, writes the Saint (*De gestis Pelagii*, 27), that the sins of all are forgiven by baptism and that all the faithful come forth from the laver of regeneration without spot or wrinkle. Moreover, every Catholic admits, and rejoices, that the time will come when the Church will remain without spot or wrinkle; for the Church is now in process of being purified. "Sed inter lavacrum," he continues, "ubi omnes praeeteritae maculae rugaeque tolluntur, et regnum, ubi sine macula et ruga perpetuo manebit Ecclesia, tempus hoc medium est orationis, ubi necesse est dicat, Dimitte nobis debita nostra." And likewise in *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* (I, 38): "Postremo regni coelorum ipsa felicitas, ubi non habebit Ecclesia maculam aut rugam aut aliquid ejusmodi, ubi nihil reprehensionis, nihil simulationis erit . . . quorum erit nisi baptizatorum?" The same doctrine appears frequently elsewhere in the works of St. Augustine (e.g., *Ad Donatistas post Collationem*, cap ix.; *Lib. Retract.*, II, cap. 18). Indeed, in the latter passage he warns his readers that whenever he refers in his books against the Donatists to "*Ecclesiam non habentem maculam aut rugam*, non sic accipiendum est quasi jam sit, sed quae praeparatur ut sit, quando apparebit gloriosa."

But Abbot Vonier's optimism is infectious. No one can read *The Spirit and the Bride* without being warmed at the fire of the author's enthusiasm. St. Augustine, it must be confessed, was inclined sometimes to look upon the dark side of things; and, moreover, his chief purpose was to make a crushing reply to Pelagius. God alone sees His Church as she really is; the Spirit alone knows the Bride. The sins of Catholics are, perhaps, apparent; but God alone sees their repentance. "History," writes the Abbot, "practically never presents us with any true account of the Church's spiritual life. We have to discard appearances, we have to go below the surface, we

have to fall back on certain realities, so obvious that the historian never mentions them. One such reality, amongst a thousand others, is this, that the Eucharistic Sacrifice has been offered up unceasingly for nearly twenty centuries. To fix one's eyes on a spectacle of that kind, will soon produce something of that wonderment concerning the Bride's riches that overcame John when he fell down to adore the angel whose hand had lifted a corner of the veil" (p. 259).

For his treatment of the Church Mgr. Fulton Sheen prefers the Pauline symbolism of the Body. *The Mystical Body of Christ*² is a book of some four hundred pages, partly theological, partly apologetical, to some extent polemical and to a great extent devotional. And, indeed, such is the amplitude of the subject that it lends itself easily to this manifold treatment. The doctrine of the Mystical Body is the central point where every dogma meets and therefore the focus of Catholic devotion; and the Church, as a sign that shall be contradicted, must ever be the battleground of apologetics. Nevertheless, it is perhaps to be wished that the author had concentrated upon one aspect of the question, the purely theological, in order to give us a deeper understanding of a doctrine whose devotional and practical implications are not far to seek. Thus there is much in the chapters on Infallibility, Scandals, Reparation, the Authority of the Church, Catholic Action, which will be read with profit, particularly where it is shown that all these attributes and activities of the Church are necessarily hers inasmuch as she is the prolongation of the Word Incarnate. The author's explanation of Infallibility is, from the apologetic point of view, adequate, though in defining its scope he seems to take no account of what theologians call the indirect object of infallibility. This may touch such subjects as history or even science, which are nevertheless explicitly excluded by Dr. Sheen from its ambit (p. 183). In the chapter on Catholic Action the author makes apt use of the metaphor of the body when he points out that Catholic Action, like the action of a living body, must be not only transitive but also, indeed primarily, immanent: Catholics can only perfect others when they have perfected themselves. Similarly illuminating remarks occur frequently throughout the book; and herein lies its chief value. But, led by the "blurb" to expect a "full length theological work," we must confess to a feeling of disappointment. The theological explanation of the doctrine of the Mystical Body is by no means as clear as might be desired.

In the first place Dr. Sheen's terminology is sometimes liable to be misunderstood. Thus I was puzzled to find a person defined as "the source of responsibility" (p. 28), foreseeing all sorts of complications when such a definition should be applied to the dogmas of the Hypostatic Union and the Trinity. It was only two pages later that I learned that the source of responsibility is, for the author, the equivalent of the subject

² Sheed & Ward. 7s. 6d. net.

of attribution. I feel sure, too, that in the following sentence the word "generation" is used in more senses than one: "The Son proceeds from the Father in an eternal generation as God, and in a temporal generation as the God-man Christ." In the second part of the sentence we should surely read "mission" for "generation"; for the Son is begotten in time, not by the Father, but by His Mother Mary. On page 93 the words "divine Assistance" are used as synonymous with "divine revelation." There is, moreover, some confusion regarding the soul of the Church. The whole of Chapter IV assigns this rôle to the Holy Ghost, in accordance with the traditional teaching of theologians. Nevertheless, we read on page 62: "The Church is the plenitude of Christ; it is the edifice of which He is the foundation; the branch of which He is the root, the organism of which He is the vivifying soul."

It is to the footnotes that the author refers us for "matter specially intended for the theologian"; and it is here that one finds some difficulty in following him. "Since Christ's Personality," we read in a note on page 29, "was not limited to a human nature, it was in a certain sense a symbol of the human race; it was possible for Christ to incorporate under His Divine Personality all the human beings that would ever be. This potentiality becomes an actuality in the Church or the Mystical Body which is the 'filling up' of the possibility of the Incarnation." In what sense is the divine Personality of Christ a symbol of the human race? And is it because the Personality of Christ is infinite act, i.e., "not limited to a human nature," that He is able to "incorporate under His Divine Personality all the human beings that ever would be"? Dr. Sheen explains elsewhere that this union is not hypostatic. Why, then, insist upon the infinity of the hypostasis? What, then, becomes of the reasoning of St. Thomas (*De Veritate*, q. xxix., art. 4), who shows that Christ is the Head of all men according to His *human* nature? The chief reason assigned by St. Thomas to show that Christ is the Head of His Body is that His human nature, by reason of its hypostatic union with the Divinity, is filled with grace, a grace which He pours out upon all the members of that mystical Body: "Of His fullness we have all received" (John i. 16).

Nor does Dr. Sheen explain clearly when the Mystical Body began to exist. We read on page 59 that "The Head of the Body is Christ—not the visible Christ who was born in Bethlehem, lived at Nazareth. . . . The Christ who is the Head of His Body which is the Church, is the Risen, Glorified Christ, seated at the right hand of the Father, the Christ whose redemptive death won for us the outpouring of the Pentecostal Spirit which made us one with Him. . . ." Where it appears that the Mystical Body, which is the Church, began to exist on the day of Pentecost. But on page 72 "(the Church) was in actual existence the very moment when the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, for at that moment Christ assumed a human nature, the 'pattern man'. . . ." While again, on

page 80, the Church in its entirety, including angels and men, embraces even those who lived at the beginning of the world. Admittedly these apparently contradictory statements can be reconciled; but the author, so far as I have been able to find, makes no attempt to do so.

Finally, one would have wished to see in the chapter entitled "The Priesthood of the Church" some reference to the Eucharistic sacrifice which is the principal act of that Priesthood. The author does indeed give some treatment of the Sacrifice of the Mystical Body—in which he embraces wholeheartedly the view of the late Père de la Taille—but he dissociates it from the Priesthood of the Church by placing no less than six chapters between them.

Clearness, conciseness and scrupulous theological accuracy are the outstanding characteristics of P. Fr. Luis Colomer's *La Iglesia Catolica*.³ In about ten pages of his first chapter the author explains, with the sure confidence of a master and the easy lucidity of the trained teacher, the main theological principles upon which the doctrine of the Mystical Body rests. The divine nature, the divine life, communicated by eternal generation from the Father to the Son; a participation of that divine nature, grace, poured out by the Word Incarnate through His humanity upon the members of His Body, the Church. In the light of these principles the Hierarchy, every single parish, the religious Orders and pious associations, the faithful themselves—all appear in their proper perspective, all in their place as integral members of this vital organism, the Mystical Body. The vital activity of the Church consists in the communication of truth and sanctity to its members, all governed by a visible authority; while the mystical Christ continues to offer up the sacrifice of Calvary in the Eucharist. Always in the light of the same fundamental principles, we are shown the development of the Church in grace and in doctrine, its indefectibility and its constant expansion. The last part of the book considers the relation of the Church to the rest of creation, visible and invisible; and, finally, its relation to the Blessed Trinity. An excellent theological treatise which one would like to see rendered accessible to the English reader.

II. PHILOSOPHY.

BY THE REV. T. E. FLYNN, Ph.D., M.A.

In his new book, *The Pain of This World and the Providence of God*,¹ Fr. D'Arcy takes us into a meeting of a society of "highbrows" to hear a paper on the Providence of God and the discussion which arises out of it—an all-night sitting, one imagines, but well worth the vigil. The theme is the problem of evil, the problem endlessly discussed by philosophers and as endlessly, in its cruder practical form, teasing the minds of

³ Valencia. 1934.

¹ By M. C. D'Arcy, S.J. Longmans. pp. 150. 5s.

more ordinary folk. "Why doesn't God stop the war?" "Why should children and animals suffer?" "Would a good God condemn His creatures to everlasting Hell?"

The reader of the paper insists on a purely philosophical treatment; and, for the most part, the "Agnostic," "Atheist," "Scientist," "Artist," and "Mystic" who take part in the discussion accept that limitation or, if they do not, are recalled to it. At the end the "Priest," while maintaining the correctness of this line of enquiry, does supplement it with some theological considerations.

I have suggested that the book represents an inordinately long meeting of any philosophical society, but as a matter of fact I myself read most of the book at a sitting, and when I had to lay it down felt as one of the audience might have felt if an importunate telephone call had compelled him to leave the company. It is a thoroughly interesting book.

In the original paper and in the subsequent questions and replies, the subject is considered from every aspect: material and spiritual evil, free will, the familiar elements of St. Augustine's answer to the problem, the relation of man to the universe, the cloudiness introduced by sentimentalism, the question of a best possible world. Especially striking is the contribution of the "Mystic" with his enlightening talk about the Angels and the Prince of this World and Man's fatal second choice at the Incarnation.

We owe a great debt to Fr. D'Arcy and every book he writes increases it. Like all its forerunners this book is sure to be widely read, and while it is too much to expect that its conclusions will be accepted by all its readers—for many will be like his low-brow "Friend" and others like the "Agnostic"—it is bound to have a deep and far-reaching effect.

A very useful and interesting series has begun to appear from the house of Téqui under the general title *Cours et Documents de Philosophie*. Two of the volumes are from the pen of the indefatigable M. Maritain,² or, to be more accurate, they are from the pencil of his stenographer who apparently took down the lectures as delivered. This doubtless has the advantages which the author claims for it in his apologetic foreword, but I think that they are outweighed by the disadvantages. The parentheses "les regressions et les redites" which, with the emphasis and modulations of the living voice, contribute to the driving home of a difficult lesson tend in the written word needlessly to complicate the subtleties of M. Maritain's philosophy.

And in these two books we are faced with subtleties. The first book professedly goes to the root of metaphysics. There we expect to be dealing with being as being, and we are prepared for hard going, and those who are familiar with metaphysical thought will not find it over recondite or very startling. The

² *Sept Leçons sur l'Être et les Premiers principes de la Raison Spéculative* and *La Philosophie de la Nature*, par Jacques Maritain.

second book proclaims itself an essay on the frontiers and object of the Philosophy of Nature. This is an invaluable book. Its main object is to show the exact place occupied in the hierarchy of thought by those subjects which are sometimes labelled Special Metaphysics, which sometimes appear separately as Psychology and Cosmology, but which M. Maritain groups together as the Philosophy of Nature. It is not such a very long time ago that Natural Philosophy was the usual name for what we now call Natural Science. And it is precisely this confusion concerning the subject matter, the limits and the methods of Natural Science, of the Philosophy of Nature and of Metaphysics which M. Maritain clears up with that abundance of learning and sureness of touch, with that suggestion of easy naturalness, which we have learned to expect from him.

He gives first a brief historic treatment. The Greeks before Aristotle were completely at sea over the place of Nature in science or philosophy. Aristotle first established the possibility of a true science of nature. By the happy mistake of a false reading of Aristotle St. Thomas brought the investigations a step forward, but the philosophers of the decadent period quite misconceived the position, and with disastrous results. In a study as fascinating as it is involved M. Maritain disentangles the skein.

Nor must it be supposed that this is a matter of merely historical or theoretical interest. In the light of these findings we are to realize that natural philosophy is not metaphysics. "Il y a de jeunes professeurs de scolastique qui pensent que la philosophie de la nature n'existe pas comme discipline essentiellement distincte de la métaphysique, ils voudraient absorber la philosophie de la nature dans la métaphysique. En cela, ils pèchent contre saint Thomas et contre Aristote, ils sont woffliens sans le savoir." But, on the other hand, we are not to suppose that the philosopher of nature (or even the metaphysician in the strict sense) may absolve himself from a consideration of the discoveries of science. "Si l'on confond la philosophie de la nature avec la métaphysique . . . on n'aura pas une métaphysique du sensible, mais on risquera d'avoir une métaphysique de l'ignorance" (p. 137). In the third place, M. Maritain exposes once again the fallacy of giving an ontological interpretation to the discoveries of mathematical physics.

I have perhaps given a disproportionate amount of space to this small volume, but, as I have tried to indicate, the small bulk is packed with matter of the greatest philosophic interest and importance.

A third volume in the same series, *Caractère et Personnalité* (by E. Peillaube), represents a series of lectures delivered to various bodies of students. A second volume was in course of preparation, but its completion has been rendered impossible by the lamented death of the author. The chapters of the first section represent a concrete study of the elements which go

to the formation of character: physical bases (bodily structure and function, endocrine glands, etc., etc.), heredity, habit; those of the second section are a more abstract study of personality and free will.

Fr. Raemaeker's *Metaphysica Generalis* has gone into a second edition.³ The first edition was reviewed in these Notes in October, 1932.⁴ Although many of the pages of this edition are almost identical with those of the first this is no mere reprint. Everywhere there are signs of a re-casting. Sometimes it is a merely formal rearrangement of the points of the thesis, but very often there are substantial additions. In place of the 450 pages of the previous edition we have now 530. The major part of the increase comes in the first volume, but it is far from negligible in the second. It appears by way of further explanations and clarification, and it is most noticeable (as might have been expected in view of recent discussions) in the sections which treat of analogy, potency and act, the real distinction. The historical section is of very great value.

The second volume of Fr. Carbone's *Circulus Philosophicus*⁵ has now appeared. The first volume was noticed in these Notes in July last.⁶ The matter is that normally found in the course of metaphysics, and the form as before exhibits each thesis as a *Propositio* followed by a series of *Objectiones*. The printing is unusually good.

Dr. Phillips is to be congratulated on the punctual completion of his task of producing a course of Philosophy in English. His present volume⁷ contains three sections: Epistemology, General Metaphysics, Natural Theology. Thus, except for Logic and Ethics which he deliberately excluded,⁸ he has covered the whole ground in his two volumes. The compactness and clarity which characterized his first volume are again evident here, and once more he puts his readers in touch with the most recent work on the subject. His sense of proportion is excellent. He never allows himself to be drawn into a discussion which would disturb the balance of the course: an evidence of restraint admirable and all too rare in a Professor. In brief, here are two excellent and workmanlike volumes which should prove very useful to seminarists or to those who wish for ready access to the traditional Catholic teaching on philosophical subjects.

The Logic of William of Ockham, by Ernest Moody,⁹ is a

³ Tome I *Doctrinae Expositio*; Tome II *Notae Historicae*. Pub. E. Warny, Louvain.

⁴ Vol. 4, p. 326.

⁵ Vol. II *Ontologia*, auctore Caesare Carbone, Marietti, page 600 In-8. Lib. It. 18.

⁶ CLERGY REVIEW, Vol. IX, p. 54.

⁷ *Modern Thomistic Philosophy*, Vol. II, by R. D. Phillips, D.D., M.A. Burns Oates & Washbourne. 9s.

⁸ Cf. CLERGY REVIEW for July, 1935, Vol. X, p. 51.

⁹ Sheed & Ward. pp. 322 and xiv. 12s. 6d.

substantial volume devoted to the rehabilitation of the famous fourteenth-century "nominalist" who is chiefly remembered as the inventor of the "razor." The author's aim is to exhibit Ockham's mind through the very words of his subject as found particularly in his *Summa totius logicae* and to allow the reader to determine for himself whether Ockham was in fact a decadent scholastic who had broken with the realism of Aristotle and thus became the bridge between Thomism and the empiricism of the sixteenth and following centuries, or whether this is a perversion of the truth due to the scientific historian's passion for a straightforward scheme of evolution of thought. The author's case is that Ockham was a nominalist in Logic and a realist in metaphysics, and that he could not have been the second unless he had been the first; that there is practically no trace of an attack on St. Thomas in his writings; that his whole object was to free the old and true Aristotelianism from the Augustinian and Arabian errors which threatened to choke it, and that his attack was delivered against the *moderni*. Mr. Moody seems to say: "It is a pity to spoil your neat historical picture, but as a matter of fact the true Ockham does not fit into it." This is a scholarly study carefully set out and copiously documented, which calls for careful examination from the expert.

Fr. Waddington, Professor of Biology at Heythrop College, in collaboration with Sister Monica Taylor, S.N.D., Principal Lecturer in Science at Downhill Training College, has produced a most satisfactory text-book of Biology.¹⁰ He has undertaken to present his matter "in such a form that the child may assimilate it as a whole." He succeeds admirably. The book comprehends all the usual "types" and it is written in a most attractive style. Its final chapters on Evolution and Heredity are excellent. In reading it I experienced one great disappointment: it was at the end of Chapter III, when I found that we were to have no more of Fr. Plater's delightful verses. It will be agreed that this is the text-book "that is different."

III. ECONOMICS AND SOCIOLOGY.

BY THE REV. LEWIS WATT, S.J., B.Sc.(Econ.).

It is a great pleasure to welcome a new book by Mgr. John Ryan, of the Catholic University of Washington, and the thanks of Catholic sociologists are due to the University of Wisconsin which invited Mgr. Ryan to give a course of lectures there last year, now published under the title, *A Better Economic Order*.¹ Mgr. Ryan deals with three main topics: industrial depression, recovery and reconstruction. Naturally he pays great attention to the American depression, which began in 1929 and which

¹⁰ *Principles of Biology*, by G. Waddington, S.J., Ph.D., in collaboration with Monica Taylor, S.N.D., D.Sc. John Murray. 349 pp. 5s.

¹ Harper & Brothers, 90, Great Russell Street, W.C. 10s. 6d.

ended in April, 1933, according to the optimists, but is still in existence according to the pessimists. Since 1790 there have been twenty-nine business depressions in the United States, though none so severe as that of 1929. The much-debated question whether the present one is of the same type as previous depressions (only more so) or is qualitatively different from them, is answered by Mgr. Ryan in the words: "The recent depression seems to have exhibited differences in kind as well as in degree from all previous industrial convulsions." The productive capacity of industry has enormously increased since the beginning of this century, owing to the great developments in the use of power, and is much in excess of actual production. Inventions, stimulated by the fall in profits due to the depression, have reduced the amount of labour needed to turn out a given volume of product. On the other hand, the burden of industrial and commercial debt has become overwhelming, so that the replacement of machinery has been rendered financially impracticable. Mgr. Ryan accepts the view that we have now passed from the machine-age to the power-age, which implies the rapid increase of labour-saving machinery and technological unemployment. He then proceeds to examine various theories to account for the 1929 depression. Mr. Hawtrey's "monetary" theory is rejected as not being in accordance with the facts in 1929; so is the theory that the depression was caused by the enormous burden of public and private debts, and the theory that over-production is impossible. "The main cause seems to have been over-production of capital goods and under-consumption of consumer's goods. . . . Too much of the national income was converted into new instruments of production; too little was expended for the products of existing capital. This unbalanced condition was caused by a bad distribution of the national income." Evidently the remedy is to ensure a better distribution of purchasing power by raising the real income of the agriculturists and increasing the share of the national product going to the wage-earners. Space does not permit an account of the further developments of this theme by Mgr. Ryan, but it may be noted that he approves of a thirty-hour week and public works. As he himself mentions, in his preface, his theory of trade depressions is the same as that long defended by Mr. J. A. Hobson in this country. The rest of his book is devoted to a critical examination of Fascism, Communism and Socialism, and to a defence of remedies put forward by Pius XI in *Quadragesimo Anno*: profit-sharing and participation by the workers in management, and the corporate organization of industry.

Signor A. Fanfani's book on *Catholicism, Protestantism and Capitalism*³ has now been translated into English. So much has already been published about the relation between capitalism and religious forms that Fanfani has been able to make great

³ Sheed & Ward. 6s.

use of the work of others, such as Weber, Sombart, Tawney, Troeltsch and Robertson, nor has he overlooked Father Brodrick's reply to the last named. Capitalism is a word that expresses many different concepts; Fanfani takes it to mean what he considers to be the essential spirit of capitalism, the unbridled desire for gain, limited only by a theoretical acceptance of the condition that the rules of honesty must not be violated. This spirit, he says, certainly showed itself in individuals even prior to the Reformation, but it could not become a social force, modifying social and political institutions, until a rival force, the Catholic social ethos, became weakened in the fifteenth century. Catholic social ethics demand that all human activities, including economic activities, be controlled by the moral law; in other words, in the Catholic ethical system there is a hierarchy of ends, the supreme end being man's supernatural beatitude, to which economic ends are necessarily subordinate. The capitalist spirit looks upon the economic order as independent of any higher order, whether social or moral or religious, subject to the somewhat inconsistent exception that fraud must not be used as a means to increase one's wealth, an exception which is the object of lip-service at any rate. Evidently there is direct opposition between the spirit of capitalism and Catholic social ethics, though this did not prevent individual Catholics from acting in the capitalist spirit long before the coming of Protestantism. In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries capitalism began to appear in Italy; competition was pressed beyond the limits permitted by the ethical system and laws of the day, the truck system was employed to keep wages down, there was speculation in loans of dubious morality, and the apparatus of commercial capitalism (scientific book-keeping, bills of exchange, etc.) developed. In England, the wool trade led to the fourteenth century enclosures, and in other countries merchants were beginning to chafe at the restrictions imposed by the Catholic social ethic. The decline of religious belief and the development of trade reacted one upon the other, so that the doctrines of Luther and Calvin were sown in fruitful soil. Whether the merchant accepted the Lutheran teaching of salvation by faith alone, or the Calvinist belief in predestination independent of good works, he found himself encouraged to believe that there was no intrinsic connection between his business activities and his salvation, so that the idea of an economic order independent of religious and ethical control spread rapidly. Action by a minority in accordance with this idea soon forced the pace (by competition) for the majority, and the capitalist spirit spread rapidly, becoming a social force which destroyed the old gild organization and captured the State. In doing so, it was greatly assisted by the widening market, due to geographical discoveries and, in certain countries, to national unification. The publishers are to be congratulated on their enterprise in having this book translated.

The Catholic social ethic is developed in another book, issuing

from Milan, *Il Messaggio Sociale di Gesù*, by Iginio Giordani,³ which very ably discusses the origin and content of the Christian teaching on such matters as the family, human personality, justice and charity, wealth, social authority and labour. On the State in particular, its origin, essence and function and its relations with the Church, on international law, world peace and the minorities question, Dr. Heinrich Rommen has written an admirably lucid and well-balanced book from the Catholic standpoint.⁴

It is interesting to compare with these Catholic works a little book by Canon Cyril Hudson, which is symptomatic of the moral unrest caused in Anglican circles by the social conditions of to-day.⁵ The author writes thoughtfully in a pleasant style, but in comparison with the Catholic books mentioned he is inconclusive. One would have liked much more of his own opinions, and much less of quotations from other people, though curiously enough in view of the book's title the social encyclicals of the Popes are never mentioned. This silence about Rome leads to something very like absurdity when the author writes that Totalitarianism has "nowhere been more effectively challenged, in recent times, than by two Anglican Archbishops." These two are Randall Davidson and William Temple. The former "dared to demand a settlement by negotiation (of the 1926 strike) after the Prime Minister had pronounced the Government's final and unalterable word to be, no discussions except after the strikers' unconditional return to work"; the latter wrote that the authority of the State "is certainly subordinate to the authority of God." Neither of these "challenges" will strike the ordinary man as particularly resounding or heroic. Surely Canon Hudson must know something of Pius X's attitude to the French Government, of Pius XI's defence of the Church against Italian Fascism, and of Cardinal Faulhaber's challenge to the Nazis. It is a pity, too, that, having read Mr. Robertson's attack on the economic morality of the Jesuits, he has not read (or at any rate does not refer to) Father Brodrick's reply.

Dr. Paul J. Glenn, professor of philosophy and social science in the College of St. Charles Borromeo, Columbus, Ohio, has set himself the task of providing "a class manual in the philosophy of human society."⁶ He has certainly conceived his subject on very wide lines, and in his preface he feels it necessary to defend himself for having included the subject-matter of Book One, which occupies nearly one-third of his book. It deals with the existence and nature of God, the creation, conservation and divine government of the world, the divinity of Christ.

³ Milano. Societa Editrice "Vita e Pensiero." 18 lire.

⁴ *Der Staat in der katholischen Gedankenwelt*. Paderborn: Bonifacius-Druckerei. Paper, 4.50 marks. Bound, 5.70 marks and 6.30 marks.

⁵ *Preface to a Christian Sociology*. Allen & Unwin. 4s. 6d.

⁶ *Sociology*. Herder Book Co., 33, Queen Square, W.C. 9s.

His Humanity and redemptive work, the Church, the human soul and its attributes and faculties, and grace. This, he claims, is part and parcel of sociological science, and must not be treated as a body of postulates on which sociology is based. He claims that "many a Catholic student comes to his classwork in sociology without the technical knowledge" of this doctrine. Well, if that be true, and if the Catholic student is not taught religious doctrine elsewhere, it is all to the good that he should be taught it by the professor of sociology. But from the point of view of methodology it is difficult to defend the introduction of natural theology, apologetics and psychology as essential parts of a course of sociology. In the other two Books, Dr. Glenn is more strictly sociological (apart from a longish discussion of transformism, which really belongs to biology). He deals with the family and its problems, the State and the Church, and such connected questions as property, labour, crime, poverty, war, race, taxation and treaties. In doing so, he covers much of what is usually regarded as forming part of the ethics course in our seminaries. Though the very breadth of his treatment might make his book useful in institutions where a full course of philosophy is not provided, his out-spoken treatment of sexual immorality renders it unsuitable for class-teaching in this country.

Father F. H. Drinkwater, in his latest book,⁷ continues his urgent advocacy of the claims of the poor. Surely no one who has read his burning words can remain complacent about the social state of this country, or fail to realize the duty of every Christian—indeed, of every citizen—to try to discover the causes of such widespread misery, and the remedies. Father Drinkwater unhesitatingly arraigns Usury as the criminal. "The fatal diseases which are killing mankind—the Unemployment *impasse*, the urge to War, the universal Insecurity—all these are the direct consequences of Usury," he writes. The interest payable on international debts, national debts, municipal debts, is the chief example of usury he gives in the chapter from which these words are quoted; but later he maintains that bank-loans to industry are also usurious. They are, he considers, usurious of their very nature, not merely because excessive interest is charged for them; so at least one gathers from certain passages, e.g. (in addition to those just referred to): "By Usury, I do not mean merely the taking of interest on loans, which is a relatively unimportant trick." Apparently, then, the taking of *any* interest is usury. Yet a few pages later it is said that since the Middle Ages *lucrum cessans* has been a genuine reason for interest on loans, though "it is rapidly ceasing to have any correspondence with the realities of modern life." I find some difficulty in understanding exactly what Father Drinkwater condemns as usury. It is to be hoped that he will publish a longer and more systematic account of the intricacies of modern finance, pointing out just where they fall under the

⁷ *Why Not End Poverty?* Burns Oates. 3s. 6d.

condemnation of usury. By so doing he would put all whose minds are deeply perturbed at existing social injustice under a great obligation of gratitude.

Women and the Catholic Church Yesterday and To-day, by Miss Olga Hartley,⁸ provides a large collection of facts about women in pre-Reformation and post-Reformation times, and establishes a good case for a decline in the status of women since the sixteenth century. Miss Hartley has a very readable style. She too speaks of usury, though only incidentally, claiming that any interest paid on State or municipal loans for erecting schools, infirmaries or asylums is usurious, and to turn teaching or nursing "into commercially profitable work is also usurious." In another passage she makes it clear that she thinks the question of usury turns on the distinction between productive and unproductive loans. This, of course, is to overthrow the traditional teaching of the schools entirely.

Before the War Messrs. T. C. and E. C. Jack published *Medieval Socialism*, by Father Bede Jarrett, O.P., in the series called The People's Books. It has long been out of print, and now it has been re-issued by other publishers.⁹ It gives an excellent account of mediæval social conditions, of Communist tendencies in those days, and of the orthodox teaching of the schoolmen, as well as of the doctrines of the lawyers and the social reformers. The final chapter on the theory of almsgiving is much more relevant to modern conditions than the word "almsgiving" suggests.

Father W. V. Baker, of the London Oratory, has put together the notes of lectures given to the Confraternity of St. Patrick, and published them under the title of *New Maryland*.¹⁰ His general theme is "economic freedom by means of Catholic Land Settlements." He suggests that Farm Colonies of five hundred acres should be founded, to be occupied, worked and owned by six families, or by thirty individuals, and divided into farms and small holdings according to the needs of the settlers. He estimates the cost of stock, implements, seed, feed of stock and subsistence of settlers for twelve months, plus the cost of the land, at £13,100, or at any rate not more than £15,000. For the first year the settlers would have to be supported by the Association which put them on the land, though after six months the Colony should begin to be self-supporting. Thereafter the settlers would gradually take over the ownership of their holding. Father Baker claims that such Colonies could be made to pay in the sense that the settlers (or "yeomen") would be able to support themselves and their families, and have a surplus to exchange for things they did not themselves produce; especially if they made use of machinery. Mr. Hilaire Belloc, who writes an introduction, believes that a free peasantry

⁸ Burns Oates. 5s.

⁹ Burns Oates. 2s. 6d.

¹⁰ Pepler & Sewell, St. Dominic's Press, Ditchling, Sussex. 1s.

can be established in this country only in proportion as England is converted to Catholicism.

As Father Baker quotes Mr. Orwin, of the Institute of Agricultural Economics, Oxford, in favour of small holdings, one turns with interest to *Back to the Land*,¹¹ the latest expression of Mr. Orwin's views. The authors wisely remind us that we must be clear as to our purpose in desiring land settlement. "Is it to create a British peasantry or is it to provide an agricultural ladder? Is it to be relief work for the industrial unemployed, or is it to be their opportunity for a new life?" In summary, Mr. Orwin and his collaborator emphatically reject the possibility of land settlement as a means of affording a new life to any large numbers of the industrial unemployed, though they favour the provision of allotments, which they urge upon the Land Settlement Association in the place of its "costly and doubtful experiments." Land settlement proper, they assure us, should be confined to the agricultural classes, 'who know the conditions of agricultural life and are prepared to accept the standard of living of the small-holder. It is to be achieved by continuing the work begun under the Small Holdings and Allotments Act, 1908. Similar conclusions are reached in *The Agricultural Dilemma*,¹² in the preface to which Viscount Astor retracts his previous unqualified support of small holdings. The conclusions of the Report may be summarized in the sentences: "Schemes of land settlement under which the men settled are expected to earn their livelihood from the land are likely to prove disappointing, and the possible scope for them appears to be very limited. . . . The system of allotments might be adapted so as to make a useful contribution to the relief of unemployment in distressed areas" (pp. 83, 84).

I have just enough space to mention that Sister Mary Ignatius Ring, S.N.D., Ph.D., has written an interesting account of the life and teaching of the Vicomte Villeneuve-Bargemont (1784-1850),¹³ one of the most famous of the precursors of the modern Catholic social movement.

¹¹ By C. S. Orwin and W. F. Darke. P. S. King. 3s. 6d.

¹² A Report of an Inquiry organized by Viscount Astor and Mr. B. Seebohm Rowntree. P. S. King. 2s. 6d.

¹³ *Villeneuve-Bargemont*. G. Coldwell, 17, Red Lion Passage, W.C.1. 15s.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

LITURGICA.

1. (a) What, if any, is the official liturgical meaning of "parochial" Mass, as applied to a Low Mass, said in churches in England, on Sundays, and preceded by the "Asperges" ceremony, and followed by the Prayer for the King?

(b) May the Leonine prayers after Mass be omitted, if this Sunday Mass is not sung by the celebrant, but the choir sing the Kyrie, etc.?

2. (a) May a Low Mass, with the privileges of a Solemn Votive Mass, of the Sacred Heart, be said in a Convent school chapel on First Fridays (when the rubrics allow it in a public church)?

(b) What, if any, are the prayers prescribed to be said in honour of the Sacred Heart, as a condition of saying the Votive Mass of the Sacred Heart? ("Capellanus.")

REPLY.

1. (a) There is not, we believe, any very strict liturgical meaning to be given to the term "Missa Parochialis," though it is part of the liturgical revival, in many places on the Continent, to make one sung Mass the chief parochial function of the week, at which every parishioner should attend if possible. Augustine writes, quoting Duchesne: "At the Masses celebrated in chapels, cemeteries, presbyterial churches, and even in the great basilicas, there were present, the stationary days excepted, only a private congregation, consisting of a family or corporation, or the inhabitants of a quarter, or any kind of association of the faithful, whether resident or pilgrims. The Mass said on such occasions was a 'private' Mass. The public Mass, that is to say, the stationary Mass, was that in which the whole Roman Church was considered to take part. This would, to some extent, tally with our parish Mass as a public Mass, and the non-official Mass as a private Mass."¹ Since we now have, in our parish churches, not one but several public Masses, the only convenient meaning to be given to the term "parochial Mass" is "principal Mass" or "chief Mass"; it is the one which is usually sung and which is preceded by the Asperges and followed by the prayer for the King.

(b) Certainly, in our view, the Leonine prayers may be omitted when this principal or parochial Mass, preceded by Asperges and followed by the prayer for the King, is a Low Mass with singing, or even without singing. There is no definite Roman

¹ *Liturgical Law*, p. 183.

instruction on the point, but by consulting the list of occasions when these prayers may be omitted, given in this REVIEW, Vol. VIII, p. 412, it will be seen that a Mass of this kind may be considered celebrated "with some solemnity," as well as being followed by "a sacred function or pious exercise." The *Westminster Ordo* contains the following direction: "Post Missam Parochialem, quae lecta sit, preces nunquam omittendae sunt; sed si legi debet Oratio pro Rege, vel alia similis, tunc omittendae sunt." At a Votive Mass of the Sacred Heart, on the first Friday of the month, when celebrated "cum privilegiis Missae votivae solemnibus pro re gravi," the prayers may also be omitted.

2. (a) The decree granting this privilege² applies "in Ecclesiis et Oratoriis," including, as Gasparri interprets it, semi-public oratories, such as that attached to a Convent school.³

(b) The same decree mentions the prayers as follows: "peculiaris pietatis exercitia in honorem divini Cordis, approbante loci Ordinario"; they are to be said in the morning. The Holy See has given no explicit directions concerning these devotions, at least not to our knowledge, and we are left to form a reasonable judgment as to what is a "special devotion." In cases of doubt, recourse may be had to the Ordinary. From the *Ami du Clergé* of recent years we draw the following indications: devotions the night before do not suffice, nor do the hymns sung during Mass, nor the recitation of a short Act of Reparation. Exposition, Benediction, or the Litanies and the prayer of Consecration to the Sacred Heart suffice.

E. J. M.

RESERVED CENSURE.

The diocesan *pagella* of faculties contains the following limited powers: "Absolvendi a casibus Nobis vel, dummodo casus fuerint occulti, ipsi Apostolicae Sedi simpliciter reservatis, exceptis, etc. (the exceptions are concerned with Canons 2319, 2385 and 2388, and IV West. Decretum, XI, 9): Dispensandi in quibuscumque irregularitatibus, ex delicto occulto tantum, exceptis illis quae ex abortu vel ex homicidio voluntario proveniunt." It would appear, therefore, that "abortion" is a reserved case. Yet, on applying to the *curia* for faculties to absolve a woman from it, I am informed that the power to deal with this censure, in the internal forum of penance, is contained in the diocesan *pagella*. (H.)

REPLY.

The solution of this apparent enigma is so simple that, were it not for the fact that the question has been submitted time and again, we would hesitate to deal with it in this column. There is attached to the crime of abortion a censure *latae*

² June 28th, 1880, n. 3712.

³ *De Eucharistia*, n. 872.

sententiae of excommunication which, by the common law of the Code, is reserved to the Ordinary: Canon 2350, §1: "Procurantes abortum, matre non excepta, incurrunt, effectu secuto, in excommunicationem latae sententiae Ordinario reservatam; et si sint clerici, praeterea deponantur." But "irregularity" also arises from this crime: Canon 985, 4: "Sunt irregulares ex delicto: Qui voluntarium homicidium perpetrarunt aut fetus humani abortum procuraverunt, effectu secuto, omnesque cooperantes." The censure excludes the delinquent, who has incurred it, from certain acts of communication with the faithful, for example, he is forbidden to receive the Sacraments. The irregularity excludes the delinquent from entering the clerical state, or from exercising the orders already received.

The *pagella* cited above grants faculties to absolve from the censure, since faculties are granted to absolve from cases reserved to the Ordinary—"Nobis"—with certain exceptions, and this censure is not included in the exceptions. But the *pagella* does not grant faculties to absolve from the irregularity since this is expressly mentioned amongst the exceptions. A woman clearly cannot be subject to irregularity. A male delinquent may be absolved from the censure in the sacrament of penance, but should he, for example, wish to proceed to Holy Orders, faculties must be sought in order to absolve him from the irregularity.

E. J. M.

BLESSINGS.

Is the blessing of pious objects valid if the priest neglects to observe the rubric directing them to be sprinkled with Holy Water. (A. M.)

REPLY.

In the official "Suffragium" to the decree of the *Congregation of Rites*, August 27th, 1836,¹ a blessing is defined as "precatio quaedam, qua aliqua sanctitas confertur, et illa proprie dicitur quae fit nomine Ecclesiae, et ex auctoritate a Deo ei concessa, quando nempe quis ratione sui muneris, quo fungitur, petit a Deo ut vel personis vel rebus bona convenientia tribuat. Deus enim posuit Sacerdotes et Ministros Ecclesiasticos dispensatores benedictionum suarum. . . . Deo itaque operante in ministerio Sacerdotali benedictio ecclesiastica suum sortitur effectum; non quidem ex opere operato ad instar Sacramentorum, sed ex vi precum Ecclesiae, quae cum Christi sit sponsa, non potest non exaudiri. . . . Tota itaque benedictionum Ecclesiasticorum vis posita est in oratione et invocatione Ecclesiae, quae fit per suos ministros; hinc est quod non aliis formis, non aliis verbis uti quisque benedicendo debeat, quam iis, quae ab Ecclesia sunt constituta."

For the effect to be secured it is necessary to use those

¹ *Decreta Authentica*, Vol. IV, p. 360.

"forms" and "words" which the Church has directed to be used. In many cases, particularly when a very short form is allowed, consisting of a simple sign of the cross, there is no mention of the use of holy water. In other cases, for example, in the blessing of the nuptial ring, its use is directed. We are of the opinion that, for this latter group, the omission of holy water renders the blessing invalid. Canon 1148, §2: "Consecrationes et benedictiones sive constitutivae sive invocativae invalidae sunt, si adhibita non fuerit formula ab Ecclesia praescripta." It seems to us that the use of holy water, when prescribed, is an essential part of the "form." "Haec aspersio cum precibus ad benedictionem ut causa efficiens benedictionis concurrat, quia res precibus et simul aspersione benedicuntur. Quamvis conveniat ut res aqua benedicta physice tangantur, non oportet tamen ut quaelibet in particulari tangatur."² The General Index to *l'Ami du Clergé* indicates a reference to the year 1911, teaching that the use of holy water is not necessary "ad validitatem," but the reference is inexact, and we cannot find any other author who discusses this point explicitly except F. Hecht, P.S.M., in *Periodica*, 1927, p. 25, who agrees with our opinion "Deficiente aspersione praescripta, benedictio invalida fit."

E. J. M.

EPISCOPAL THRONE.

Is it permitted, on the occasion of a bishop's visit to a parish church, to erect for him a throne on the Sanctuary *with a canopy* as in the Cathedral Church? (T.)

REPLY.

Caeremoniale Episcoporum, Lib. I, cap. xiii., n. 3, directs that a canopy should not be placed over the *sedes episcopalis* unless there is a canopy over the altar also, the reason presumably being that the *sedes* should not be given a greater honour than the altar itself. After describing the construction of the throne the text continues "... et super eam umbraculum, seu baldachinum eiusdem panni et coloris appendi poterit, dummodo et super altari aliud simile, vel etiam sumptuosius appendatur; nisi ubi super altari est ciborium marmoreum, vel lapideum; quia tunc superfluum est, nec aptari commode potest." An answer of the Congregation of Rites directs the episcopal throne to possess a canopy, without mentioning any exception for those churches without a canopy over the altar.¹ But it is clearly more correct, we think, to follow the direction of the *Caeremoniale Episcoporum*.

E. J. M.

VESPERS DURING EXPOSITION.

Is any special permission required in order to sing Vespers

² *De Herdt*, III, § 295, ad 6.

¹ S.C.R., August 6th, 1763, *Decreta Authentica*, 2471, ad 5.

before the Blessed Sacrament exposed? If it is liturgically in order, should the monstrance be veiled during the singing of the Office? (B.)

REPLY.

There is no particular difficulty in singing Vespers before the Blessed Sacrament, if Exposition is lawfully held. But a decree of the *Congregation of Rites*, July 13th, 1883, ad 4,¹ forbids Vespers of the Dead during the Octave of All Souls, even though the monstrance is covered with a veil;² the Church has always regarded public Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament to be incompatible with an Office for the Dead, though provision is made in the *Instructio Clementina*, §XVII, for All Souls Day, when it coincides with the Forty Hours' Exposition.

With regard to the necessity of a veil, we have an instruction of the *Congregation of Rites*, September 10th, 1796, which bears indirectly on the point: "An chorus, dum recitat Horas Canonicas ante SS.mum Sacramentum velo coopertum in loco eminenti, sedere et tegere caput cum bireto valeat; vel stare debeat nudo capite, quasi illud esset sine velo? Resp. Potest clerus sedere, tecto etiam capite cum bireto; sed laudandus esset, si sederet detecto capite."³ It is implied, in this answer, that the office should be sung standing if the Blessed Sacrament is not veiled, but, if the Blessed Sacrament is veiled, the Office may be sung seated.

E. J. M.

¹ *Decreta Authentica*, n. 3582.

² Cf. *CLERGY REVIEW*, VII, p. 254

³ N. 2552 ad 1.

BOOK REVIEWS

Religion in School Again. By Rev. F. H. Drinkwater. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. 5s.)

Father Drinkwater remains fresh and challenging—as ever. Vigour of thought, felicity of phrase, touches of humour illuminate his pages. This is a collection of essays which for a space of eight years, 1926-1934, appeared in various periodicals. Such collections are often dull and boring, real second-hand stuff. One feels that they have been strung together for no other purpose than to “make” a book. Here you have the feeling that the essays have been collected together to enhance their individual worth, like pearls to make a string.

Not all the essays bear on the title of the book, but they were worth preserving for their own intrinsic merit. One slight essay, “De Propaganda Fide,” is chock full of a commonsense not universal amongst Catholics in England. Another, “In the New Houses,” is a picture so full of delicate touches and colour that one is urged to implore Fr. Drinkwater to write. And if he asks “what about?” the answer is “about anything, like Charles Lamb and Belloc. Simply write.” For Fr. Drinkwater is what is called a “born writer.” Like the “born musician” or the lark, he cannot turn out poor stuff.

In this book the author is, in the main, on his old, familiar ground. The spread-over of the essays in point of time is important, for it reveals him not as progressing in his ideas but deepening in his convictions. Years ago he discovered two profound truths which had been largely lost sight of in the teaching of religion though common enough elsewhere. The first was that the teaching of religion should be made interesting and appealing; the second that its learning should not be an intellectual *tour de force* like the learning of French irregular verbs, but should be a spiritual growth. They say that there are still places left where these two truths are unknown and even flouted. But that may be exaggeration.

Throughout these pages Fr. Drinkwater keeps impenitently at his theme. For nearly twenty years he has kept at it in face of much misunderstanding and much criticism, a lot of it ignorant and unfair. We do not yet realise how deep his influence has been, not merely in England, but abroad and in America. The next generation will realize it, for by then his “original and startling” ideas will be the commonplaces which he himself has always declared them to be.

No priest, no teacher can afford to pass over his ideas of which this book is a summary. The theme itself and his treatment of it are much too distinguished for that. You may be credulous, slightly sceptical, (possibly) violently hostile or, like

most of those who have studied his ideas, warmly appreciative. You cannot be indifferent. He is one of those writers who set you saying at every turn "How true that is." He is so beautifully clear and sane that you wonder how he can have been so much misunderstood. Criticism he invites. His hard words about fixed syllabuses and text-books will not, for instance, call an echo from heads of big schools with big classes and teachers not naturally gifted for the ideal methods he advocates. Nor again from the teachers themselves who know how guarded and accurate they have to be in talking about the Mass, grace, the sacraments, etc. Few priest teachers can forego the security of the fixed religious syllabus and the comfort of the printed definition and explanation. It is hardly fair to expect the lay-teacher to do so. Again, provided that, by pooling our knowledge and experience, we can set up syllabuses approaching as near as possible the ideal, there seems to be no reason why they should not be universal. The Catholic children and teachers of Clapham in no way differ in their religion from the Catholic children and teachers of Chorley. Nor is the external examiner without his merits. He has a marvellous faculty for discovering weaknesses. It is not necessarily the syllabus or the text-book that spoils the lesson. It is the teacher all the time.

Finally, for those who will insist that the Sower scheme is out to do away with the Catechism, we give a quotation from page 177: "*The Sower* believes so strongly in the important place of the Catechism in the school that it wishes to have it done under the best possible conditions."

F. G.

A History of the Church. An introductory study. Volume Two. The Church and the world the Church created. By Philip Hughes. (Sheed & Ward. 15s.)

Father Hughes is to be congratulated on the completion of the second stage of his task and he has now carried his church history down to 1274. The task of compressing the religious history of nine centuries into a volume of rather under five hundred pages must have been most onerous and the balanced character of the presentation is a tribute to the author's success. The length has been very well adapted for use in colleges and Fr. Hughes has presented a bird's eye view of the main lines of the situation. The descriptions of the political development between the period of St. Augustine and the rise of the Carolingian Empire are notably clear and he has placed the Hildebrandine effort in good perspective. The account of the Crusades and of the relations of the Latin East to Western Christendom is particularly lucid and this is certainly the most balanced account in English of the relations between the Papacy and the Hohenstaufen Emperors. The book is very readable and is marked by unity of treatment.

It is impossible within the author's limits to give a very clear impression of the development of thought and the section

on St. Bonaventure, for instance, illustrates this contention. Still in the sweep of these pages we get an exhilarating sense of the movement of the Church's life and a stimulating account of her relations with the Empire. The sections on the different Popes are particularly valuable and Father Hughes shows great skill in describing the variations of outlook and character. The book is a consistent whole and the author is on no occasion submerged by the mass of material at his disposal.

The volume closes with ten pages of bibliographical notes and a full index. There are also four valuable time charts which give a clear idea of the chronology of the subject. An interesting and detailed map of the Catholic conquest of Continental Europe is included as well as four rather inadequate outline maps of Europe. The progress of the Reformation is seldom worked out in detail and Messrs. Sheed & Ward would add considerably to the value of Father Hughes' next volume if they included detailed maps of the religious changes of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Father Hughes' work is indispensable for students of history and no college library should be without this most attractive and judicious survey.

DAVID MATHEW.

The Catholic Church in Modern Wales. By Donald Attwater. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. pp. ix. and 235. 8s. 6d.)

There is a well-known guide-book called *A Gossiping Guide to Wales*. It is full of information, of a chatty but substantial kind, about the history and topography of that wonderful country. To walkers, and others in search of the hidden treasures of the Welsh scenery, it is indispensable; it is the sort of book by which the armchair traveller justifies himself.

Mr. Donald Attwater might well have called his book *A Gossiping Guide to the Church in Wales*. It is "gossiping," in the sense that it tells, in an easy, attractive style, a story that, in less adroit hands, might have settled down to dullness, or become merely a page of the *Directory* amplified. It is indeed an heroic story; and in Mr. Attwater's pages it is very much alive. It is a Tale of two Tides: one at the ebb, the other at the flow. The Faith receded very slowly from the hearts of the Welsh people. It is not too much to say that, owing to misunderstandings and prejudices, it was allowed to slip away. Persecution alone was not responsible. The supply of missionary priests was wholly inadequate. Had Wales been as well served as Lancashire in this respect, it would be a Catholic country to-day. But the Tide of the Ancient Faith went out inexorably, and in Mr. Attwater's story one hears "its melancholy, long, withdrawing roar." Is the Tide turning yet? Mr. Attwater, with a twenty years' residence in Wales to speak for him, is not too sanguine, and gives his reasons. In Welsh eyes, the Church is still "Irish" and foreign. When, in the course of time, the descendants of these "foreigners" become

more Welsh than the Welsh themselves, then the great conversion will have begun; and the sea of Faith will come flooding in again to reclaim its own.

The story of the other Tide is the story of the progress and preservation of the Faith among the non-Welsh settlers in Wales. The spiritual needs of these people are fairly well provided for now, especially in the large industrial centres. Formerly it was not so; and the work of the pastorate encountered many well-nigh unsurmountable obstacles. Mr. Attwater gives us several brief character sketches of truly apostolic workers in this stubborn area of the Vineyard.

This excellent book would be greatly improved by the inclusion of a map of Wales.

J. R. MEAGHER.

St. Thomas More. By the Rev. Sir John O'Connell, M.A., LL.D.
(Duckworth 6s. net.)

There are (we are told) some thirty English *Lives* of St. Thomas More. Of all these *Lives* if one were asked to say which was the simplest and best introduction to the history of St. Thomas More one might answer, without much hesitation, that this latest Life by the Rev. Sir John O'Connell is the best. It does not pretend, of course, to compete with the classical work by Professor Chambers, which was published (a note informs us) while the latest Life was being printed. Sir John O'Connell thus had no opportunity of accepting and incorporating the analysis of Utopia which is contained in the work of Professor Chambers. It must indeed have needed some resolution to publish this work after Professor Chambers had given his work to the world. Yet we are glad that Sir John O'Connell was not deterred, for he has given us a book worth reading. It is in truth written "in an easy and delightful style" and it gives us an accurate picture of the life of Thomas More in the City and the Inns of Court and his own domestic surroundings in London and at Chelsea. The narrative is at once simple and learned and the work is manifestly a labour of love.

If the book has the success it deserves a second edition will be called for in the course of time. In preparing the new edition we venture to suggest to Sir John O'Connell that it is error to suppose in the story of the trial that Sir Thomas More made any declaration to the effect that he "had acted according to his conscience in opposing" the King's second marriage. Such statement is indeed attributed to him in the earliest authorities (and is accepted even by Professor Chambers) but a perusal of the indictment shows that there was no charge against More in connection with his opposition to the second marriage of the King and he was too good a lawyer to introduce irrelevant matter.

Again, the indictment shows that the conversation with Rich

took place on June 12th, 1535 and not on June 14th as is stated on page 176. On June 14th certain interrogatories were administered to More: which shows that two days after this conversation the Crown were still seeking material to build a case.

One word more (apart from our thanks and congratulations) to Sir John O'Connell who was once a practising lawyer: why did Thomas More fail, at the trial, to take the point that Fisher did not fail to take in his own favour? Why, that is, did More the lawyer fail to urge upon his judges that, in a trial for treason, it was necessary to have the evidence of two or more witnesses and that in his case the word of one man only stood against him? It is one of the most interesting problems in the life of Thomas More to which no one has yet supplied an answer.

RICHARD O'SULLIVAN.

The Ancient Religious Houses of Devon. Adapted from the *Historic Collections* and the *Monasticon Dioec. Exoniensis* of George Oliver, D.D. Edited by Dom John Stephan of Buckfast Abbey. (Price 2s. 6d. Catholic Records Press, Haven Road, Exeter.)

The history of England, like that of the rest of Europe, is largely the story of her churches and monasteries. It can hardly be questioned that the men of the Church, whether they were surpliced canons, cowled monks or hooded friars, created a civilization which had enough vitality to survive those who gave it birth. An army in occupation of territory recently wrested from a barbarian host protects itself and all that it stands for by forts and strong places. The almost countless monastic houses with which the soil of England was once studded were so many barriers against barbarism and so many beacons of light in a dark age. The disastrous break with a glorious past, which men have misnamed the "Reformation," laid low these seed-plots of true culture. All over the country ruins noble even in decay tell the melancholy tale of a world of beauty for ever lost, nay, in places, *ipsae periere ruinae*.

Up till 1539 many a town and verdant valley or some romantic combe or cove, so characteristic of the red coast line of Devon, was graced by the added beauty of minster or convent, though none of them could measure itself with the stately abbeys of Yorkshire and other counties. Up to the Reformation there existed in Devon no less than twenty-one religious houses of men, three convents of nuns and eight collegiate churches of secular clerics, and in three hospitals the sick received the tender care of which consecrated charity detains the secret. Alas! that we should know so little of the history of these houses.

In this field of historical research, as regards Devon, the Rev. George Oliver, D.D., of Exeter, was a pioneer. A beautiful stained glass window and a nobly-lettered inscription on marble in the mother church of Exeter recalls his *clarum et venerabile*

nomen to the mind of the visitor. During the forty-four years of his ministry in the ancient city Dr. Oliver compiled his *Historic Collections* relating to the monasteries of Devon and his even more famous *Monasticon Dioecesis Exoniensis*. The publication of these two books was an event in the literary world. Of all the religious houses of Devon (or for that matter, of all England) Buckfast Abbey alone has arisen from its ashes. Dom John, a Monk of Buckfast, has had the happy inspiration to give us in handy form a synopsis of Oliver's two works, with many additions and corrections based on extensive reading and research on the part of the studious son of St. Benedict. Thus, within the small compass of 105 pages we are given in compendious form all that can be known at present of our county's monastic history. It remains but to add that the volume is admirably produced and a map and some delightful woodcuts add interest and charm to a most readable book.

D. E.

Mr. Peter Lunn's little book, *High Speed Skiing*,¹ will prove an excellent *vade mecum* for the ski-runner, novice or expert. Having begun to ski at the age of two, Mr. Lunn has been for the past two years Captain of the British International Ski-running team and will be its Captain again at the Olympic Games in Germany this year. In this book he gives the principles and technique of high-speed skiing, a section on racing, another on equipment, and a final interesting little chapter on the psychology of racing. Mr. Lunn writes easily and clearly and with a most engaging modesty. For him sport has a significance which transcends the mere sense-pleasure of speed or the enjoyment of laurels won at the cost of risk and endurance; it involves an accepted discipline and is rewarded by moments of ecstasy in the realization of the control of body by mind.

T. E. F.

St. John Fisher. The Earliest English Life with Introduction and Notes by Philip Hughes. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. 6s.)

This fascinating sixteenth-century life of the martyred Bishop of Rochester is edited by Fr. Philip Hughes who contributes a scholarly introduction, in the course of which he gives us a brief but beautiful memoir of the Bollandist Father van Ortroy, S.J., the responsible compiler of the critical text of 1893.

T.E.F.

¹ Methuen. pp. 128 and x. 3s. 6d.

REVIEWS FROM ABROAD

The December number of *THOUGHT* opens with a thoughtful article by Dr. J. M. Cooper on "Magic and Science." Dr. Cooper is a Catholic priest and a trained anthropologist, the editor of the periodical *PRIMITIVE MAN*, and in this paper he examines the questions: What are the proportionate rôles of magic and science in primitive thought and action? and In what measure has science been an outgrowth of magic? After defining his terms carefully, he sets out the pertinent empirical data, and then enquires what bearing such data have upon the two questions proposed. His data are drawn largely from the culture of the northern Canadian Indians, notably the Cree and Montagnais of North-Eastern Canada, and from personal observation, he is able to bring together an imposing number of facts regarding their beliefs. His conclusion is that, even among the advanced horticultural peoples, magic in no way monopolizes thought and activities, and that science appears to have developed not from magic, but chiefly from earlier science which, though often rudimentary, contained "a body of conceptions and activities that had little or nothing in them of the supernatural or magical." In "St. Paul and the Slave," Fr. W. J. McGarry, S.J., reviews the question of slavery in the Roman empire and St. Paul's contribution to the doctrine of human equality before God. In "Savonarola and Alexander VI," Count Michael de la Bedoyère explains in detail the history of Savonarola's mission. Fr. W. H. McClellan, S.J., writes in "Rich Men in Ancient Israel" on the patriarchal period and discusses the conditions of labour and productive wealth during that epoch in sacred history. "The Foundations of Physical Laws," by Fr. H. Lawton, S.J., is an argument for the inadequacy of physical science as a means of arriving at the ultimate laws of the universe.

THE CATHOLIC WORLD for December is a strong and remarkably interesting number. In "Chesterton as Poet," Dr. Joseph J. Reilly offers us a dispassionate survey of Chesterton's work which does not shirk a discussion of the occasional weaknesses in the poems. As might be expected, considerable space is devoted to "Lepanto," "The Ballad of St. Barbara," and "The Ballad of the White Horse." In "A Declaration of World Civil War" Miss G. M. Godden surveys the course of world politics with special reference to the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International. Dr. Adolf Schückelgruber, in "The Church in Germany: Kulturkampf or Persecution?" contrasts the situation of the Church in Germany under Bismarck's régime with its position at the present day. This involves a careful study of the character of Adolf Hitler and concludes: "Kulturkampf is not the right term for what

is going on. I should prefer to speak of methodical annihilation of the Church." "The Wonderful Saxon," by Mr. C. R. Ginder, himself a musician, is a spirited account of the life and work of George Frederick Handel.

The December HOMILETIC AND PASTORAL REVIEW gives pride of place in its list of contents to "A United Front," an English summary and adaptation of Fr. Josef Will's *Handbuch der katholischen Aktion*. The meaning of Catholic Action is clearly explained and a summary of Papal pronouncements and a list of Papal documents will be appreciated by many readers. "The 'Pre-Agony' Period," by Mgr. Henry, is a study of the death-agony, partly medical and partly homiletic and devotional. Stress is laid upon the prayers of the Ritual, upon the practice of a daily anticipation of death, and upon the duty of warning the sick in good time of the desirability of summoning a priest. "On Behalf of the Angels," by Fr. W. Farrell, O.P., discusses the doctrine of the angels as an antidote against materialism and as an invigorating principle of Catholic life and worship. Fr. Stanislaus Woywod, O.F.M., writes on "Ecclesiastical Penalties" with special insistence upon ignorance of the law, the violation of the law through negligence or lack of due care, and the liability of minors.

Perhaps the most interesting article in LA VIE INTELLECTUELLE for November 10th is that on "Publicité, Presse et Vie Moderne," by Ernest Pezet, which emphasizes the immense position occupied in the modern world by commercial publicity campaigns, campaigns organized by or on behalf of the State, tourist organizations, and efforts for intellectual, artistic or economic expansion. It discusses the need for some form of organized control, which would ensure at least some measure of truthfulness and responsibility.

In the REVUE THOMISTE for November-December, M. Maurice Blondel replies to some criticisms of Père Garrigou-Lagrange, O.P., with regard to the necessity and ontological value of the first principles of reason. Père Garrigou contributes a letter thanking M. Blondel for the simplicity and cordiality of his answers to the questions proposed. Père Etienne Hugueny, O.P., gives a detailed review of the recent work entitled *L'oeuvre exégétique et historique du R. P. Lagrange* (See CLERGY REVIEW, Vol. X, pp. 140-143).

The Advent issue of the REVUE LITURGIQUE ET MONASTIQUE, edited at the Abbey of Maredsous, opens with a short article by Dom P. Passelecq on the Messianic prophecies connected with the season. Dom S. Couneson begins a series on the practice of making visits to altars as it appears in monastic tradition. Of special interest to English readers is a long and highly appreciative review by Dom B. Becker of the recently published *Spiritual Letters* of Abbot Chapman.

In ANGELICUM for October-December, P. Damasus Trapp, O.E.S.A., contributes a long article on "Aegidii Romani de

doctrina modorum" which concludes that Aegidius, in his explanation of the ultimate constitutive of personality, is certainly not a Nestorian, though his doctrine is both unhelpful and unconvincing. Many readers of Wilhelm and Scannell's adaptation of Scheeben's *Handbuch der Dogmatik* will welcome the short account of the Cologne theologian's life and work by P. H. Wilms.

THEOLOGIE UND GLAUBE (1935, 6 Heft) provides, as usual, a good variety of articles. There are, among others, contributions on Amos and the alleged "unsacrificial" Mosaic period (Dr. H. Junker), on the meaning of obedience in the New Testament (Dr. O. Kuss), and on Mahommedan asceticism (Dr. H. Stieglecker). Among the more practical articles, Dr. E. Eichmann discusses the excommunication incurred according to Canon 2319, §1, by reason of marriage before a non-Catholic minister. P. Michael Bäuerle, O.M.Cap., contributes an interesting study on the fate of children dying without baptism according to the doctrine of St. Bonaventure. After a short introduction which stresses the practical nature of the enquiry, P. Bäuerle devotes some pages to a summary of received opinion regarding the possibility of a special *meritum de congruo*, obtainable by devout parents in regard of their unbaptized children, and then proceeds to answer the three serious objections that have been made to such a view.

In DIVUS THOMAS, September-December, edited from the Collegio Alberoni, Piacenza, Père E. Schiltz, Missionnaire de Scheut, brings to an end his study of "Le Problème Théologique du Corps du Christ." In his opinion no advance has been made since the fifteenth century, towards a definitive solution of the problem and: "Dans cet état de chose, il serait prématuré de se prononcer définitivement pour ou contre la présence d'une forme cadavérique dans le Corps mort de Notre-Seigneur." D. M. Fatta determines the relation between the scholastic doctrine of Hylomorphism and contemporary physics, and Dr. A. Rossi, C.M., supplies a lengthy *compte-rendu* of the tenth National Congress of Philosophy at Salsomaggiore (September 7th-13th, 1935).

J. M. T. B.

THE CHURCH AT HOME AND ABROAD

I. FRANCE.

BY DENIS GWYNN, D.LITT.

The past month has been even more crowded with excitement and events in France than in England. M. Laval has had to deal with an acute internal crisis which threatened an immediate outbreak of civil war, besides facing the enormous complications of the situation at Geneva and concocting the famous peace proposals with Sir Samuel Hoare. His difficulties have been so great that it is impossible to withhold sympathy with any man who has the courage to persevere in facing them. He has shown qualities of tenacity and adroitness which have proved him to be one of the ablest politicians France has produced for many years; and in the past month he has achieved at least two personal successes on a scale that recalls the achievements of Briand or Lloyd George. But they have been even more short-lived than is usual with the successes of a dexterous manipulator of party politics and of diplomacy. M. Laval's reputation seems to have fallen almost as suddenly as it rose, but he has undoubtedly emerged as one of the ablest figures in recent politics.

His success in overcoming the crisis concerning the Fascist Leagues was even more spectacular and sudden than the conclusion of the peace proposals. It is now generally known that the dramatic scene of reconciliation in the Chamber was skilfully prepared as a result of private negotiations with both sides. M. Ybarnegaray was admirably qualified to play the leading part. He is one of the chief figures in the Croix de Feu, an ardent orator with a powerful voice and a commanding presence. Illness had kept him from the Chamber for many months and his reappearance helped to heighten the effect. He had consulted closely with Laval before he made his famous appeal for national unity, for which he has a passionate desire. He was an intimate friend of Marshal Lyautey, whose remains have recently been transferred to Morocco for burial amid scenes of fervent patriotism; and Lyautey is said to have charged him and Colonel de la Rocque, before he died, with the sacred duty of effecting a national reconciliation. In that spirit M. Ybarnegaray made his urgent appeal for unity, and promised that the Croix de Feu would give up any arms they might possess and would support legislation to make it illegal

to carry weapons. M. Blum's immediate intervention with a similar offer had been arranged beforehand by Laval; and that afternoon the Government introduced short Bills to give effect to the agreed resolutions of the Chamber.

But the effect evaporated almost as soon as the excitement died down. Calmer reflection showed that the Croix de Feu were only offering to give up arms which they had always said that they did not possess; while the Socialists and Communists had only promised to abandon any militaristic character in their own organizations, which always repudiated militarism. The usual quarrelling revived over the amendments inserted to strengthen the Government's Bills; and it was soon evident that Laval had only postponed the crisis by arranging an emotional scene. Each side accused the other of trickery, and in the meantime Laval proceeded to conclude the peace proposals with Sir Samuel Hoare. Here also there was a similar accusation of trickery, when the French Press was enabled, by a well-timed "leakage" of information, to commit the British Government before the Cabinet had time to consider and approve the final terms.

Both issues had indeed been connected more closely than appeared. The main argument for offering large concessions to Italy was that France could not guarantee the use of the naval bases in the Mediterranean to the British Fleet without mobilizing her naval reserve; and under the constitution the French Navy cannot be mobilized unless the Army is mobilized also. Laval knew that mobilization of any kind was impossible so long as the Leagues threatened civil war, and quite possibly a march on Paris, if they were called upon to mobilize against Italy. The Left wing of his Cabinet were pressing for dissolution of the Leagues with that object, among others, in view; and Laval outmanœuvred them by arranging for the famous scene in the Chamber.

His chief strength has, of course, consisted in his persistent efforts to keep France out of incurring any risk of war. To that extent he has given every encouragement to the pacific efforts of the Holy See; and the creation of three Cardinals for France at this month's Consistory has at least appeared to gain his encouragement. Half of the twenty new Cardinals are prominent officials of the Vatican City, and four are Nuncios. Of the remaining six—or only five, if one excludes the Patriarch of Antioch as not being of the Latin rite—two are French bishops, while one of the four Nuncios is Mgr. Maglione the Nuncio in Paris. Except for Cardinal Pacelli there is certainly no other member of the Vatican's diplomatic corps who has played such a vital part in peace negotiations ever since the War. He was in Berne during and after the War—while the Vatican was actively engaged in war relief works and in the exchange of wounded prisoners; and while the League of Nations was taking root and expanding in its

early years. He came from Switzerland to Paris as successor to the late Cardinal Cerretti as Nuncio, and for five years he has been intimately connected with every phase of Catholic Action in France.

Mgr. Maglione's promotion to the Sacred College was a foregone conclusion, as his period as Nuncio has now almost expired. It was virtually necessary also that one of the French bishops should be made a Cardinal to replace the vacancy left this year by the death of Cardinal Andrieu of Bordeaux; since there is a long tradition that France shall not have less than six Cardinals. An attempt was even made under Leo XIII to have the usual number raised permanently from six to seven, but Pope Leo refused. The Holy Father has followed precedent in appointing another archbishop to replace Cardinal Andrieu in the Sacred College. (There were already Cardinals Verdier of Paris, Maurin of Lyons, Binet of Besançon and Liénart of Lille, as well as Cardinal Lépicié in Rome.) He has chosen Mgr. Suhard of Rheims, who has many obvious qualifications. Ordained in 1898, he was made Bishop of Bayeux and Lisieux seven years ago. In two years he made great progress with the Basilica of St. Thérèse at Lisieux, and at the end of 1930 he succeeded Cardinal Luçon at Rheims.

Mgr. Baudrillart, the other new Cardinal for France, has been known all over the world for many years as Rector of the Institut Catholique in Paris. At his consecration as bishop in 1922 he was acclaimed as having inherited the place formerly held by Lacordaire as "the foremost priest in France." By a special permission of the Holy Father—which has apparently not been given since Cardinal Newman was granted the rare privilege—Mgr. Baudrillart is to continue living in Paris. This month has included the celebration of the University's diamond jubilee, and for some forty years Mgr. Baudrillart has been one of its chief figures. He entered the priesthood late, after beginning a career of great promise in the State Universities, and then joined Mgr. d'Hulst in helping to make the new Institut Catholique a success. In time he became Mgr. d'Hulst's biographer, and he has continued his work as Rector for some thirty years. In that period he has been made a bishop, an archbishop and a Cardinal; he has been elected to the French Academy and received the highest grade of the Legion of Honour. The Institut has grown out of all resemblance to its early beginnings under his vigorous and inspiring direction. Its staff and faculties as well as its students have increased immensely, and it has exercised a profound influence on the whole life of France, particularly since the War. And as Rector of the University, with his special scholarship and literary gifts, his urbanity and breadth of outlook and his splendid power of organization, he has created one of the most striking intellectual organizations of modern France.

II. CENTRAL EUROPE.

BY C. F. MELVILLE.

AUSTRIA.

Catholic University for Salzburg.

Some months ago I commented in these columns on the plan, which was then being mooted, for a Catholic University at Salzburg. I am now able to give full information regarding this project, and the appeal for funds which is being made.

Salzburg, which is to-day so well known for its Musical Festival, is a city with a long history, and used to be the seat of a flourishing university. The work of mediæval scribes at Salzburg may be seen to-day in the British Museum. Early in the seventeenth century, the schools of learning were consolidated and erected into the University, which was maintained jointly by the Abbeys of Southern Germany and Austria. Until the time of Napoleon the University flourished, but it suffered from the general secularization of ecclesiastical property, and through the nineteenth century only the Theological Faculty remained active. The ideal of restoring to Salzburg its full University curriculum was increasingly cherished among Austrians in the last century, and a University League was formed which had collected a large sum of money by 1914, but all of this money was lost in the subsequent inflation. The Austrians took up the project again after the War, the late Dr. Seipel who had himself been a Professor in the Theological Faculty, and the late Dr. Dollfuss, both ardently desired to see the University restored, that it might serve as an intellectual centre in Austria at a time when new and hostile doctrines are threatening religious and cultural traditions in Austria from many quarters.

The Prince-Archbishop of Salzburg, the holder of the See which for long centuries held the primacy in the Holy Roman Empire, is now devoting himself to carrying through this work, which the late Chancellor had placed among his intimate concerns just before his assassination. In the last weeks of his life, Dr. Dollfuss had invited the members of the Theological Faculty of Salzburg to meet him in order to discuss the scope of the restored University. His Grace has received a small grant from the Austrian Government which is beset at the moment by acute financial anxieties, while collections in the churches have shown how readily the poorest Austrians came forward with their savings for a project which has touched their imaginations. In spite of so much local sacrifice, the Archbishop finds himself unable to begin unless he can obtain a few thousand pounds from additional sources outside Austria itself.

To assist him in realizing this long cherished ambition with English help, the "Friends of Salzburg University" have been

constituted in this country, with the object of raising £4,000 here, as the minimum required to launch the University anew, in addition to what has been collected elsewhere.

While the auspices of the University of Salzburg will continue as in its long past, to be Catholic, it is believed that the revival will appeal to many others. It is intended to provide Summer Courses in Languages and the Arts, courses which will be held in the same months as the great musical fixtures and arranged to fit in with them. But the heart of the new University will be found in the new Chairs from which there will proceed the argued reassertion of fundamental truths concerning the existence of God and the nature of duties of Man. The University will stand as a fortress against the militant atheism which is now sweeping through so many parts of the world. At a time when reason is so widely derided and history is made to subserve present-day political purposes, a foundation where the teaching will be objective, and based on reason and not on expediency, will be of value far beyond the boundaries of Austria itself, and should command the support of English men and women.

The buildings, including the old Senate Hall, are already there, and are fine examples of Renaissance work. The funds now being raised are needed, not to build, but to provide live teaching in halls that have for too long been silent. It is indeed the Archbishop's hope to develop at Salzburg the College system as it flourishes at Oxford and Cambridge, and to build and equip a College will need £10,000. But eventually, if generous help is forthcoming, the object is to endow some Chairs, one of which would be devoted to the teaching of music. The sum needed for each Chair is also £10,000, which is, incidentally, very much less than would be needed to endow a Chair in this country. His Grace intends to dedicate the first Chair to the memory of Dr. Dollfuss, and the second to St. John Fisher and St. Thomas More, the English Saints whose lives and martyrdom mark them out as the patrons of a Chair to be devoted to enunciating the moral rights and duties of men in relation to their fellows.

Austria, the heart of the old Holy Roman Empire, has been for centuries the main bulwark against the successive waves of enemies of Christendom who have thrown themselves against the eastern frontiers of Europe from the time of the Roman Empire till the final defeat of the Ottoman Turks before Vienna in 1683. To-day Austria, though shorn of its old political greatness, remains a cultural citadel with a claim on the support of all those who recognize and treasure the unique heritage of European civilization.

The Friends of Salzburg University in Great Britain have accordingly banded themselves together and are resolved to see that from Great Britain help is forthcoming, for this as for

other projects in the past, for the well-being of a country and a people with whom a warm friendship has for so long been maintained, even through political estrangement and war. They seek to reach all those who would like to have a part in this revival of an old University in one of the oldest and most beautiful centres of European life. The Friends of Salzburg University will be arranging various entertainments and other means of bringing together those who are active well-wishers of Austria and Salzburg. In the meantime, donations, large or small, may be sent to the Chairman, Lord Howard of Penrith, c/o Austrian Legation, 18, Belgrave Square, London, S.W.1, or to the Vice-Chairman, His Excellency, Baron Franckenstein, the Austrian Legation, 18, Belgrave Square, S.W.1.

The Church and Social Justice.

The Austrian bishops recently issued an Episcopal Letter on social conditions which is of great interest in connection with the Church's attitude to those social questions which the new Austrian Corporative constitution was framed to meet.

The Bishops speak of complaints they have received, regarding the unjust treatment of workers by employers. They say that it is not right to generalize about Austrian employers. Many of them realize their duties in the Corporative State, and many of the difficulties complained of, such as lower wages, are due to world economic crisis.

Wage reductions in Austria have not been more acute than in other parts of the world. Also: employers have a right to a reasonable profit. On the other hand, there are some employers who make the general economic difficulties an excuse to make wage reductions which are contrary to social justice. This is unfair to the workers who are looking forward to social justice within the Corporative State.

The State recognizes its duties as defined by social justice, and the Bishops record with satisfaction the various efforts of the Government to prevent infringement of the rights of the workers.

The Bishops especially welcome the creation of Workers' Courts in which arbitral awards will be valid. They also welcome the steps which are being taken for the creation of a controlling body, by giving the Trade Union the right to take action on behalf of the individual worker.

The Bishops, furthermore, attach great importance to the Government's schemes for combatting unemployment, especially the schemes for land settlement of the unemployed. This, they continue, is one of the best ways of improving the lot of the worker, as was originally indicated by Pope Leo XIII.

The Bishops also refer to the question of price levels. It is

well known, they say, that the Papal Encyclical, *Quadragesimo Anno*, upon which the present Austrian constitution is founded, calls for social justice as the cardinal principal of economic life. This applies to the consumer no less than to the producer. While the producer has a right to a fair profit, the consumer also has a right to ask that he should not be made the victim of the fixing of prices at unjustifiably high levels. The Bishops recall previous occasions upon which they have denounced attempts to control markets, or influence price levels against the consumers' rights.

The Bishops call for co-operation and the creation of corporative organizations which will ensure that social justice is fully carried out. They conclude with a tribute to what the Government has already accomplished in this direction.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE SCHISM OF HENRY VIII.

Fr. Andrew Beck, A.A., St. Michael's College, Hitchin, Herts, writes :—

So far as I can see, nothing that M. Constant wrote last month weakens in any way the criticisms of his book which I made in March. It would have been quite easy for him to say that he had *not* depended on Pollard, or that he *had* used the *Letters and Papers* in preparing the first part of his *Reformation in England*. I note that he does neither. The rest of his article is largely beside the point.

May I make one further remark on M. Constant's book, and one on his article?

In Pollard's *Henry VIII* (p. 175) there is an incorrect reference. It is reproduced in Constant (p. 51, n. 61). Professor Pollard has been kind enough to explain to me how it occurred. "In my original notes from the *L. and P.* the last I had taken from Volume II was 4692. I then went on reading 'The King's Book of Payments' which has no numeral reference; and in writing my narrative I inadvertently gave my last numeral reference to a detail which occurs on p. 1,449 and relates to the expenses of February, 1511." I wonder if M. Constant can explain how this faulty reference found its way into his book. And if this reference is from Pollard, must we not be suspicious of the others?

In his article (p. 432) M. Constant states that "Wyclif, Lollardism, and their consequences are matters of common knowledge." I think it would be truer to say that their consequences, in England at least, are matters of common historical disagreement. Apart from that, however, M. Constant then does a remarkable thing which seems to justify my contention that he does not always read the documents he quotes. He refers to "a learned study not yet published" by Miss E. Jeffries Davis. I can only conclude that he has taken the title of this study from M. Janelle's *L'Angleterre Catholique à la Veille du Schisme*, and that he has not read it himself. It is a thesis with which Miss Jeffries Davis gained an M.A. Degree at the University of London in 1913, and is, on the whole, opposed to M. Constant's opinion. I take the liberty of quoting from her *Conclusions* (p. 54 of the typescript) :

It is probable that the London Lollards were themselves few in number. None of them, except Hun, seems to have been a person of any importance in the City. . . .

On the whole the evidence tends to show that they were in no sense strong enough to be reckoned as one of the causes which brought about the beginning of the Reformation.

M. Constant's article has merely confirmed me in my opinion that the early part of his book is not based on original sources,

or rather, on original sources published in England, such as the *Letters and Papers* and the various *Calendars* of State Papers. His book, I still maintain, has been influenced by Pollard, and in view of that fact, its conclusions must be accepted with considerable caution.

I note that in his article M. Constant tends to modify his account of pre-Reformation England, in the sense of the conclusions reached by M. Janelle. I sincerely hope that the latter's book will soon find an English translator. It richly deserves one. Meanwhile, M. Constant's book will undoubtedly be accepted as the standard modern Catholic authority on the Reformation in this country. Because of that, and because the book is otherwise so valuable, I feel that these criticisms are not only justifiable, but necessary; and hope that M. Constant will listen to another reviewer who "would venture to suggest that the first chapter of this volume be revised."

Dr. Messenger writes:—

There is evidently a serious difference of opinion between the Abbé Constant and myself as to the character of the doctrinal formulæ of the reign of Henry VIII, which I assure him I have read. In my forthcoming work, *The Reformation, the Mass and the Priesthood*, I give quotations from them, and explain in detail my reasons for thinking them unorthodox. The Abbé Constant, on the other hand, considers them orthodox, save for the authority of the Pope and the relation to the civil power. This is not altogether surprising, in view of the fact that the Abbé considers that the doctrine of the Real Presence "reste intégrale" in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI, and that even the permanence of the Presence is not denied in the Second Prayer Book! (See his article in *Eucharistia*, p. 222.) An author who can make such a statement about the heretical books of Edward VI naturally finds little to object to in those of Henry VIII! The Abbé actually goes so far as to say in his *Reformation in England*, and again in the *CLERGY REVIEW* for last month, that Cardinal Pole ordered the "King's Book" of Henry VIII to be read in the churches of the diocese of Gloucester in the reign of Queen Mary! This is an unpardonable blunder. The work Cardinal Pole thus recommended, was, not the "King's Book," but Bishop Bonner's *Profitable and Necessary Doctrine*. Even Dixon, in his *History of the Church of England*, makes this perfectly plain, so that the Abbé's mistake is really inexcusable. I deal faithfully with other erroneous statements by the Abbé in my new work.

A DIFFICULTY IN THE MISSAL.

Rev. J. R. Meagher writes: Can any of your readers solve the following puzzle? The *Offertorium* for the mass of the eighteenth Sunday after Pentecost is given in the Missal thus: "Sanctificavit Moyses altare Domino, offerens super illud holo-

causta, et immolans victimas; fecit sacrificium vespertinum in odorem suavitatis Domino Deo, in conspectu filiorum Israel." The Ratisbon edition (1930) of the Missal gives the reference as Exodus xxiv. 4, 5.

However, on consulting the text of the Vulgate, I find that verses 4 and 5 of Exodus xxiv. read as follows: "Scripsit autem Moyses universos sermones Domini, et mane consurgens aedificavit altare ad radices montis et duodecim titulos per duodecim tribus Israel. Misitque juvenes de filiis Israel, et obtulerunt holocausta, immolaveruntque victimas pacificas Domino, vitulos."

Now, even if we allow that the Missal antiphons are older than the Vulgate, and therefore differ from it textually in many instances, it is still obvious that the above *Offertorium* is in no sense a translation of Exodus 4 and 5. A comparison of the Hebrew and LXX confirms this, if confirmation were wanting. At the same time, it is clear that the first half of the antiphon (sanctificavit . . . victimas) is a rough précis of Exodus 4 and 5. But what shall be said of the second half? Nowhere in the entire chapter is there any reference to an *evening* sacrifice. In fact, verse 4 definitely states that Moses got up early in the morning in order to erect his altar (cf. the Hebrew and LXX); and there is no reason to suppose that his assistants spent the whole day in preparing the victims.

Schuster (*Liber Sacramentorum*, V, p. 175) says that the *Offertorium* in question is built up "per saltum" from Exodus xxiv. (*trae saltuariamente i suoi elementi da*, etc.). This, by the way, is precisely what happens in the case of the *Offertorium* for the twelfth Sunday after Pentecost, where the chapter quoted from is Exodus xxxii., and the antiphon is made up of fragments and adaptations of verses 11, 12, 13 and 14. Schuster's explanation, however, does not get over the difficulty of "sacrificium vespertinum." The second half of the antiphon is certainly not taken from Exodus xxiv.

Whatever be the explanation of the puzzle, one thing is quite clear: namely, that the editors of the Missal are not justified in referring the reader of this *Offertorium* to verses 4 and 5 of Exodus xxiv.

in
,
ace

nat
sit
ens
per
et
cas

der
ny
in
of
ng.
non
l 5.
the
ice.
the
X);
the

the
dus
by
ium
oter
up
14.
alty
hon

uite
fied
d 5

THE CATHOLIC MEDICAL GUARDIAN

Vol. XIII. No. 4. The Quarterly Journal of the Guild of St. Luke, St. Cosmas, & St. Damian, Oct., 1936.

OUR HOLY FATHER, THE POPE, BLESSES THE EDITOR AND THE MEMBERS OF THE GUILD THE ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING NOTES ON THE ANNUAL REPORT THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS, 1936 EDITORIAL.—Our Lepers. The Silly Season Dichotomy. The Plithora of Doctors. The Preliminary Training of the Doctor. Should the Doctor tell? ORIGINAL ARTICLE.—Mettray, by Dr. R. G. Cookson. REVIEWS AND LITERARY NOTICES.—Dr. Mary Cardwell's "Some Aspects of Child Hygiene." Fr. Pinney's "Moral Problems in Hospital Practice."

Fr. Gemelli's "The Franciscan Message to the World." "The Message of the Sacred Heart of Jesus." CONTRACEPTION AND STERILIZATION A WARNING RE THE STERILE PERIOD ACTIVITIES OF OUR MEMBERS. OBITUARY.—The late Dr. A. H. Spurrier, C.M.G., O.B.E. Publishers: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, Ltd., London: 43, 44, 45, Newgate Street, E.C.1. Price 1s. 4d. Annual Subscription, 5s. 0d. (post free). Subscription for United States, \$1.50. NOTE.—Editor's Address and Office of the CATHOLIC MEDICAL GUARDIAN, Heathwood, Bushey Heath, Herts. Telephone: Bushey Heath, 1406.

FRANCIS TUCKER & CO.

ESTABLISHED 1780 LTD.

Manufacturers of Genuine Beeswax Candles

ALSO SUPPLY

FRAGRANT INCENSE

IN SEVERAL QUALITIES, AND CHARCOAL for use with INCENSE OF VARIOUS KINDS.

Cricklewood Lane, London, N.W.2

Telephone: SPEEDWELL 6227

Telegrams: ENLIGHTEN, LONDON

THE BREAKESPEARE CLUB.

KENSINGTON PALACE MANSIONS, DE VERE GARDENS, LONDON, W.8. (overlooking Kensington Gardens). Telephone, Western 8486. The new Catholic Social Club. Reading and writing rooms. Bedrooms (reduced rates for members 6s. a night with bath, up to 3 nights).

Entrance fee, £1 1s. Annual subscription, £3 3s. (Half-yearly rate for those joining now).

For further particulars apply to Hon. Secretary.



**chalices-
OSBORNE**
117 GOWER ST.
LONDON, W.C.1.
SEND FOR BOOK 16

John Hardman's

John T. Hardman Stained Glass 43 Newhall-Hill
Donald B. Tawton Birmingham &
John Hardman Paintings Mosaics 1, Albemarle
& Co. Limited Church Decoration St. Pancras
Private Compy. London, W.1

GERALD J. HARDMAN,

5a, Temple-row, BIRMINGHAM.

Telephone: Central 3763.

All kinds of Church Furniture,
Metal Work, Carving in Wood and
Stone, Renovations. Gilding, &c.

CHURCH BUILDINGS IN NEW HOUSING AREAS

HARBROW'S

TEMPORARY AND SEMI-PERMANENT BUILDINGS AFFORD DURABLE, EFFICIENT, ECONOMICAL AND EXPEDITIOUS MEANS OF MEETING ALL REQUIREMENTS.

ESTD. 50 YEARS.



Semi-permanent Church.

Write for Suggestions, Estimates and Drawings.
Dept. U.

WILLIAM HARBROW, Ltd.

**SOUTH BERMONDSEY,
LONDON — S.E.16**

THE CATHOLIC ANNUALS For 1936

THE CATHOLIC DIRECTORY. The 99th issue of this indispensable handbook of the Catholic Church in Great Britain. Edited at Archbishop's House, Westminster, it is the official organ of the Hierarchy of England and Wales. Its monopoly of information secures its use by clergy and laity throughout the year. A map of Dioceses and Missions in England and Wales is included. Cloth 3/6

THE CATHOLIC WHO'S WHO. Cloth 5/.

THE CATHOLIC DIARY. A day-to-a-page, of handy vest-pocket size, giving the Kalendar of the Universal Church, and other useful information as well as a thought for every day. Cloth 1/-; Leather 2/6

THE CATHOLIC ALMANACK and Guide to the Services of the Church. Giving a complete ecclesiastical Kalendar, with colours of vestments and much other valuable information, in an extremely compendious form. Wrapper 2d.

THE SACRED HEART BLOCK CALENDAR. A daily tear-off pad with appropriate thought for each day, giving the Feasts, Fasts, Abstinence Days, etc., of the Church's year. 1/-

THE CHURCH ART CALENDAR. An artistic twelve-page turn-over Calendar in colour. 1/6

THE LITURGICAL FISH-PAD CALENDAR. Printed in red and black. A fish indicates the days of Abstinence. $4\frac{1}{2}'' \times 3''$ 6d.

THE ORDO RECITANDI DIVINI OFFICII.

Editions for the Dioceses of Westminster, Salford and Southwark.

Westminster Edition, 1/6

Southwark Edition, 1/6 (interleaved, 1/9)

Salford Edition, 1/9 (interleaved, 2/-)

Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd.,
43 44 45 Newgate St., E.C.1 and 129 Victoria St., S.W.1

AND AT

MANCHESTER - GLASGOW - BIRMINGHAM - DUBLIN

Printed in Great Britain by Gibbs & Bamforth Ltd., St. Albans, Herts.

S

ble
ch-
of
by
ons
/6

5/-

ize,
na-
/6

ch.
und
rm.
2d.

oad
sts,
1/-

ver
/6

ck.
5d.

9)
-.)

7.1